

# RELIGION IN LIFE

## A CHRISTIAN QUARTERLY

Vol. IV

Summer Number, 1935

No. 3

### EDITORIAL BOARD

JOHN BAILLIE

CHARLES K. GILBERT

JOHN W. LANGDALE

WILLIAM ADAMS BROWN

LYNN HAROLD HOUGH

HOWARD C. ROBBINS

LUCIUS H. BUGBEE

JAMES R. JOY

FREDERICK K. STAMM

HENRY P. VAN DUSEN

### ADVISORY COUNCIL

Harvie Branscomb

Carl Sumner Knopf

Halford E. Luccock

Edgar Sheffield Brightman

Edward H. Kraus

Harris Franklin Rall

Clarence Tucker Craig

Umphrey Lee

Richard Roberts

Albert Edward Day

Edwin Lewis

Wilbour E. Saunders

Wilbert F. Howard

Mellyar H. Lichliter

Luther A. Weigle

### CONTENTS

	PAGE
The Ladder of Faith.....	George A. Buttrick 323
The Book of Proverbs.....	John Oman 330
The Significance of Jesus for Our Conception of God.....	Francis Pickens Miller 337
Paul as Christian Apostle and Jewish Rabbi.....	Alfred E. Garvie 343
A Theology of Disillusion.....	Frank Kingdon 353
Some Ideals of Education in Religion.....	Frederick C. Grant 364
The Clinical Training of Theological Students.....	H. Flanders Dunbar, M.D. 376
Mysticism.....	John W. Hoffman 384
The Desperate Deliverance.....	James Percival Huget 397
Good News for the Underprivileged.....	Howard Thurman 403
Happy Marriage.....	George Stewart 410
A Night in a Russian Monastery.....	John Sheridan Zelie 421
A Minister and His Books.....	Thomas Wearing 431
Name Your Favorite Hymn.....	Stanley Armstrong Hunter 442
Bultmann as a Barthian.....	Gilbert T. Rowe 447
Book Reviews.....	455
Bookish Brevities.....	478

Editorial correspondence should be addressed to John W. Langdale, 150 Fifth Avenue, New York, N. Y.

Business communications regarding subscriptions, etc., should be addressed to The Abingdon Press, 150 Fifth Avenue, New York, N. Y.

Entered as second-class matter January 16, 1932, at the post-office at New York, N. Y., under the Act of March 3, 1879. This number is the July, 1935, issue.

Subscription price, \$2.00 per year; postage free U. S. Possessions and Mexico; to Canada, 18 cents additional; other foreign postage, 30 cents; single copies, 75 cents.

Published by

THE ABINGDON PRESS  
NEW YORK

CHICAGO

CINCINNATI

BOSTON UNIVERSITY  
COLLEGE OF LIBERAL ARTS  
LIBRARY

## Who's Who?

**GEORGE A. BUTTRICK, D.D.** Minister of The Madison Avenue Presbyterian Church, New York City.

**HELEN FLANDERS DUNBAR, B.D., M.D., Ph.D.** Director, Council for the Clinical Training of Theological Students, Inc., New York City.

**ALFRED E. GARVIE, M.A., D.D., D.Th.** Principal New College, Hampstead, London, England.

**FREDERICK C. GRANT, D.D., Th.D.** Dean of Seabury-Western Theological Seminary, Evanston, Ill.

**JOHN W. HOFFMAN, D.D.** San Marino, Cal. President Emeritus of Ohio Wesleyan University.

**JAMES PERCIVAL HUGET, D.D.** Minister of The Shelter Island Presbyterian Church, Shelter Island, N. Y.

**STANLEY ARMSTRONG HUNTER, D.D.** Minister of St. John's Presbyterian Church, Berkeley, Cal.

**FRANK KINGDON, D.D.** President of Dana College, Newark, N. J.

**FRANCIS PICKENS MILLER, B.A., M.A. Oxon.** Chairman of the World's Student Christian Federation and Field Secretary of the Foreign Policy Association, Washington, D. C.

**JOHN OMAN, D.D.** Principal Emeritus of Westminster College, Cambridge, England.

**GILBERT T. ROWE, D.D., Litt.D.** Professor of Christian Doctrine, School of Religion, Duke University, Durham, N. C.

**GEORGE STEWART.** Minister of the Presbyterian Church, Stamford, Conn.

**HOWARD THURMAN, B.D.** Associate Professor of Christian Theology, School of Religion, Howard University, Washington, D. C.

**THOMAS WEARING, Ph.D., D.D.** Dean and Byron E. Huntley Professor of English Bible and Greek Exegesis, The Colgate-Rochester Divinity School, Rochester, N. Y.

**JOHN SHERIDAN ZELIE, D.D., Litt.D.** Wits End, Westwood, Mass.

---

Copyright, 1935, by The Abingdon Press, Inc. All rights reserved—no part of this magazine may be produced in any form without permission in writing from the publisher, except by a reviewer who wishes to quote brief passages in connection with a review written for inclusion in magazines or newspaper.

Printed in the United States of America

## The Ladder of Faith

GEORGE A. BUTTRICK

**T**HERE is a striking epitaph, quoted by George Macdonald, and said to have been written (though for this fact we cannot vouch) on the tombstone of an old Norseman buried in Scotland. It reads as follows:

"Here lie I, Martin Elginbrodde;  
Hae mercy o' my soul, Lord God;  
As I wad do were I Lord God,  
And ye were Martin Elginbrodde."

That is not irreverent. It has sturdiness and a fineness of faith. It assumes that the goodness of God, though infinitely greater than ours, is not different in kind. The light of our candle is one in nature with the light of His central sun. The flowers on our table are but a fragment, but they are one in meaning with the beauty of heaven and earth.

### I

We all believe in God. We are different only in calling Him by different names. The self-announced atheists "protest too much," and give their case away—like small boys stubbornly closing their eyes to deny the day. The real atheism is in practice. All men have their name for God. Some call Him "Power," and deem Him blind, deaf, and dumb; though they could hardly gainsay that the "Power" is organized Power gleaming with Purpose, and therefore not so blind. Some call Him "Law," and deem Him cold; though they could hardly gainsay that the "Law" (as in the law of harvest) often serves our need, and is therefore not so cold. Some call Him "The Mystery," the "Great Deep" from which we come and to which we go:

"A whisper from our dawn of life, a breath  
From some fair dawn beyond the doors of death."

It matters mightily what we call Him. For if it is true that conduct shapes our faith, it is also true that faith shapes our conduct. If all our hopes and heroisms are but fireflies dancing a tragic moment over a dark uncomprehending marsh, if our love amid the forces of the universe is like a child caught in a stampede of wild horses, we shall find our life shaped and mocked

by that creed. But if the core of reality is like Christ and Calvary, our life of tears and tenderness might well become a pilgrimage toward Home. What shall we call God? In what direction shall we go to find Him? From New York to Yonkers is just a little way up the Hudson; but if we sailed south instead of north, we would wander far before we found it. Is there a quicker way to God than the weary ocean way of science and philosophy?

## II

The answer of Jesus is clear. Take the best in human life, He tells us, and then argue up from that to God. Fix on the finest that our earth can give, and read it into God, saying, "How much more," until it fills ocean and sky and time and eternity. Such is the flashing counsel of our text: "If ye then, being evil, know how to give good gifts . . . how much more shall your Father in heaven. . . ." Why not begin with the *best* we know? Why begin with a grave, and say, "God is death"? Why begin with an observed uniformity, which we please to call a "law," and say, "God is an inviolable rule"? Why begin with brute force, and say, "God is power"? Why not begin with the best, and say, "God is like that, only much more—more beyond all horizons"?

What *is* the best? Jesus says the best thing on earth is the girding love of a true home. Something in a father and mother makes them forego and forget all poor desire of gain to think only of their children's good, and that Something (says Jesus) is both the sovereign fact of earth and the best clue to the nature of God. The finger of Jesus is on that "fine careless rapture" as the best thing our earth holds—on a parent's unselfish love. Draw your own inference. We argue and argue about the sex problem and the question of divorce. It is a baffling and complex issue, not to be solved by any rule of thumb. But we may wisely note that Jesus' probable query would be: "Divorce and the new 'freedom'—what are they doing to children? What are they doing, not only to children of an unhappy home, but to all children of all homes?" That, apparently, would be His starting point; a better starting point than any supposed "right to be happy." Draw your own inferences. And make your own comparisons. With Karl Marx, for example. He was a courageous and grandly sacrificial soul; and that fierce, uncompromising book of his (*Das Kapital*) ought to be read by people who would be literate concerning the changes in our world. No university economist, it is safe to say, more accurately prophesied our present

tumult. But compare his core of human life, the class struggle (for it is reasonably true to affirm that the class conflict is for him the nub of the human drama), with what for Christ is central and best. For Christ the real thing is the love that binds a home, and must one day bind all men in one family. The comparison makes clear the daring originality of the mind of Christ.

"If ye then, being evil"—people caught in shadows and poisoned by self-regard—"know how to give good gifts." . . . And we do know. If our children ask for a fish, we do not give them a serpent that looks like a fish but stings. If they ask for bread, we do not give them a stone that looks like bread but which breaks the teeth and stills no hunger. Unworthy though we be, we would not mock a child. Christmas Day and each birthday are joyous times. From no present ever received did we gain such unblemished happiness as from the presents we give to children. Of course a child's cry for help must be heeded, a child's daily need must be met. A parent who would despise his child or injure him would be just what we call him, "inhuman"—hardly human. The love that in self-forgetting service finds its deep delight is the best thing on earth—the broadest, deepest, and the highest. Therefore, it is the best clue to the nature of God. For God's love is not different in kind from ours (Martin Elginbrod was right), but it is "how much more!" That "how much more" is the ladder by which we climb all the way from earth to heaven. "If ye then, being evil, know how to give good gifts unto your children . . . how much more shall God care for his children of flesh."

### III

"But," our finely realistic modern mind would tell us, "such a concept of God is too anthropomorphic." The meaning of that cumbersome word is clear: "anthropos" is the Greek word for "man"; and "morphe" in the same language means "form." This teaching, we are told, portrays God in the form of a man. Xenophanes said centuries ago that if oxen had gods they would think of them as oxen. That gibe is to-day frequently revived. Is it true? It is both true and untrue.

Whatever thought of God we may cherish must obviously come through our nature. We cannot leap outside ourselves, or suddenly take on the mind of angels, when we think about Him. Doubtless every conception of God is colored by our frailty and bemeaned by our prejudice. The scientist who

describes the world as a "machine" or as a "realm of law" has not escaped the human bias; for no one has heard of a machine without an inventor or mechanist, or a system of laws without an originating mind. Better an "anthropomorphic" view of God than a "lego-morphic" or a "mechanomorphic" dwarfing of His grandeur! Inevitably we depict God in our form. Even so, the portrayal may not be wholly false; for the picture comes not only of our painful search but of His own invasions and revealings.

But, as a matter of fact, Jesus here takes issue with anthropomorphism. He corrects our easily distorted picture of a God made in our own image. He teaches us to say, "How much more." "If ye then, being evil;" but God is not evil. Human parents are poor in wisdom and blind in selfishness, and their love grows weary under long provocation; but God's love has no lack. "If ye then, being limited." . . . But God has no trammels save those of His compassion. Jesus is here friends with our modern demand that God must not be drawn merely as a larger man. We say "He" of God, but we realize the narrow constraint of the pronoun. All words are poor to describe God, but the word "It" would be poorer than "He." So would our modern titles, such as "The Principle of Concretion," or "The Power not ourselves that makes for righteousness"—titles which kindle neither mind nor heart. "In Him we live and move and have our being," is a description which would be only less absurd than blasphemous as applied to any man. We remember that we are cabined in tiny flesh, whereas the universe with all its suns and stars is but the trailing of His garment:

"The sun, the moon, the stars, the seas, the hills and the plains—  
Are not these, O Soul, the Vision of Him who reigns?

"Glory about thee, without thee; and though fulfillest thy doom,  
Making Him broken gleams, and a stifled splendor and gloom.

"Is not the Vision He? tho' He be not what He seems?  
Dreams are true while they last, and do we not live in dreams?

"And the ear of man cannot hear, and the eye of man cannot see;  
But if we could see and hear, this Vision—were it not He?"

We must remember also that only God can create and only He can destroy. We cannot bring anything into being. We can but fashion from materials given to our hands—whether it be an aeroplane or a great concerto. We cannot destroy, causing anything to go out of being. If we blasted away a hillside, its dust would remain; and if we turned the dust into gases, the gases would still elude our destruction.

"Before Jehovah's awful throne,  
Ye nations bow with sacred joy;  
Know that the Lord is God alone,  
He can create and He destroy."

We remember the vast hinterlands of mystery without which God could not be Godlike. We bow creaturely adoring before One who lifts the skies and guides the æonian torrent of time. God's goodness is one in kind, though purer far, than our goodness: this we may affirm with thanksgiving. But with added thanksgiving we escape narrow, angular, and unworthy views of God by learning through Christ to say of His wisdom and power and love, "How much more! How much more!"

#### IV

"But," some starkly honest mind might still object, "if we take the best of earth as clue to the character of God, why should we not take the worst?" It might be enough answer to say that taking the best as clue gives light to the mind, radiance to the emotions, and energy to the will; and that whatever thus serves the whole of our nature is presumptively true. But another answer would be as follows: if we take the best as clue, we can measurably understand what seems the worst; whereas if we take the worst as clue, there is no explanation for the best. The faith that there is no reality except matter and blind chance leaves almost everything unexplained—the manifest order of creation, the corresponding harmony in the mind of man, the beauty in "which all things work and move," the conscience of the saint, and the love of Calvary. Materialism as a creed thus becomes an affront to the intelligence. But if we take the best as clue, what appears tragic is at least partly understood.

"If ye, being evil, know how to give good gifts." . . . If ye then, being bewildered in glooms of selfishness, still realize that you must say "no" to some childish askings! . . . If ye then, being indulgent, still realize that disciplines have their place in growth of character! . . . If ye then, being blind to the highest good, know full well that your children must be subjected to ways of life whose meaning now is not clear but shall be clear hereafter! . . . All these things we do know. We do say "no" to our children: it would fare sadly with them if always we said "yes." We do set them in the midst of disciplines, as, for example, in day school. We do require of them unpleasant tasks whose purpose is not at once plain. In Lancashire, the cotton manufacturing district of Europe, rain is frequent

and heavy. But the cotton would crack if the climate were dry: rain is livelihood. Children do not know it. But we know it; and, seeming cruel, we set them in the storm.

That is as good an explanation of pain and loss as we can find. It proves itself in experience. Much we now comprehend which, when it happened, was mysterious and tragic. Better to explain evil so, and then to live in courage and faith, than to leave Christ and our best selves forever unexplained. Our children sometimes fight—not at their parents' prompting but to their parents' grief. They must grow into larger freedom. They must not be compelled. So they fight in selfishness. It is not always the parents' blame. God is never guilty of our hateful wars: He grieves for them even unto the blood-letting of Calvary. "If I were God," we sometimes say. But, fortunately for our world, we are not God. We are but children

"crying in the night  
And with no language but a cry."

There is a Father-Mother Heart who knows our needs better than we know them, sorrows over our strife, and binds up our undeserving brokenness.

## V

If only this word had been regulative in Christian theology! There was a day when it was believed that unbaptized infants would perish in hell if they died. The only needed question on that matter was, "Would *you* treat your child in that way?" "If ye then, being evil, know. . . ." There still persists the idea that hereafter God will hold a Grand Assize and with arbitrary power will sentence us here or there. Would *you* treat your children so? There is still the obscene notion haunting us of a God whose earthly imagination runs to physical torments and an inescapable hell. How would *you* treat your children in their dark wrongdoing? Why make God in the image of a cruel man? Why not make him in the image of a wise Father? There is the darker notion abroad that God is flabbily indulgent, doing nothing and saying nothing to show that men are made for righteousness and compassion—a God amenable to unruliness and murder. What would *you* do? Would *you* think it wise or kind to save your children from all remedial disciplines and pains? There are those who believe that at death we lose all marks of selfhood, and are merged in some ocean of life—immortal only in our influence. But how would *you* treat your children? Would you take that dear child, with gestures well loved and a

bloom of character all his own, and break up all his distinctiveness, saying: "Back to the dust from which you came!" Pursue these inquiries for yourselves. The clue to God's character is through our best—not through the image of a tyrant throne, not through the image of a law court, however just, but through the image of a faithful home.

## VI

He shall "give good things to them that ask Him"—not what we *think* is good, but what He *knows* is good. Then let us ask Him. Ask Him by daily fidelity in toil, wherein you serve without fret and without grasping. Ask Him in your daily love for your neighbors here and across the sea—since quarrelling children know not what to ask. Ask Him in your constant prayers; kneel before Him as children. Pray submissively: His wisdom is better than ours! Ask repeatedly: desires are purified even while they are uttered; and, when they are wisely denied, they change of themselves. But ask confidently: He will not give you a stone when you ask for bread. If you get a stone, it is because some brother has stolen your share of food; and then God's tendernesses still remain, over-ruling our fratricide. Ask confidently: He has given you so much even without your asking—dawn and sunset, seedtime and harvest, the solace of home, and that eternal Home which is the Heart of Christ. So ask confidently: He will not withhold any needful thing while He yet has work for you to do on earth.

William James suggested the "ladder of faith," as follows:

1. There is nothing absurd in a certain view of the world.
2. It might be true under certain conditions.
3. It may be true even now.
4. It is fit to be true.
5. It ought to be true.
6. It must be true.
7. It shall be true, at any rate for me.

Climb this great ladder of faith. There is nothing absurd in the idea that the clue to God is through the best of earth. It might have been true, had man believed it. It may be true even now. It is beautiful enough to be true. It ought to be true. It must be true. It shall be true, at any rate for me. I shall hereafter live with God as my Father, and with all men as my brethren.

## The Book of Proverbs

JOHN OMAN

THE Book of Proverbs, being seldom read as a whole, is usually taken to be no more than a collection of sayings of shrewd, worldly common sense, more on a level with the Odes of Horace than the Gospels. Even so, our restless, grasping, modern world might still have something to learn from the fine, sensible, contented, level-headed Epicureanism of Horace, and more from even the least exalted parts of the Proverbs. If those who interpret the ideal held up before Achilles, "Always to be first and to be above others," as doing more business and making more money by it, usually at the expense of other people, could get some hint from both that making much money is not making the most of life and that, without genial regard to others, it is not a blessing at all, their time would not be wasted; and if the writers on it could learn from them to express themselves in pithy, finished figure and aphorism, not only would their style be more pleasing to a literary taste, but their ideas would be refined by the process and be less distressingly crude.

Take, for example, the praise of diligence, which recurs so constantly and with such varied illustration. "Go to the ant, thou sluggard, consider her ways and be wise. . . . Yet a little sleep, a little slumber, a little folding of the hands to sleep: so shall thy poverty come as a robber, and thy want as an armed man." Or consider the account of how diligence also brings honor. The household of the virtuous woman, who looks well to the ways of her household and eats not the bread of idleness, is clothed with strength and dignity as well as scarlet; the man who is diligent in business will stand before kings; and the value of wealth is to make many friends.

This may not be the highest ideal in the world, but it is a great deal higher and more human than the ruthless idea of push and spreading oneself because having much wealth many kow-tow to you. The writer of Proverbs would, I think, have appreciated the story of the successful ship-owner who said to a friend, "Have you heard that they want to make me a baronet?" "Well, it is a great honor," the friend replied. "May be," was the retort, "but I am not having it. Think of those fine old fellows who have hailed me for the last forty years with 'Morning, Tom,' having to say,

'Good morning, Sir Thomas.' Man, they would not be friends any more but merely acquaintances."

Moreover, there is much shrewd practical advice which would make the Stock Exchange a safer place, and which would help to make money not a plaything of speculation, but a symbol of work done, greatly to the profit of honesty and a sounder social as well as economic existence. The ideal is steady attention to business without haste to be rich, contentment with a reasonable success which provides social esteem as well as private comfort, in a home blessed by a happy marriage and well-brought up children, with kindly relations to all men, carefulness in speech, control of temper, kindness of manner, a helping hand to others, especially in money-matters, and a becoming and decorous recognition of duty to God.

This might end in a sleek obesity of mind and soul as well as body, blind to noble purpose, soft for strenuous endeavor, incapable even of imagining any high adventure, yet, such as it is, great diligence and prudence and self-mastery and self-denial went to the making of it, and, without this, no higher achievement would have been possible for mankind, any more than it is now for the individual.

The Book of Proverbs is not a mere collection of shrewd, worldly-wise aphorisms, but collects the lessons of applying one general principle for the understanding and mastery of all experience. This was applied throughout many generations and among many peoples, and the collection of these results in Proverbs may be late in the history of Israel, and probably from a much wider field. But it is the more valuable for this very reason, being the fullest record known to us of the results of interpreting the universe by the uses of freedom and their measurably equal awards.

What is most noteworthy in the book is the way in which, though very unlike the prophets, yet doubtless by the influence of their higher morality, it enlarges and deepens this hypothesis of the equivalence of action and award; and this always by attempting to relate the whole of life to God. The unsystematic nature of the treatise and the way it mixes different strands of experience and different stages of its interpretation may show that the writer is rather a collector of other people's reflections than himself a discoverer. None the less, it is all under this principle and is the record of a long, patient, successful, and enormously important inquiry, scientific as well as religious, because it is an attempt to embrace all the facts of experience as well as to enlarge the hypothesis which seeks to explain them.

The true reason why diligence is rewarded is that it is almost one with goodness. Men's labors are blessed not merely by what they accomplish; but the diligent are blessed, because they are upright; and a curse attends like a shadow upon the idle, because they are wicked. So we pass to the more general principle of the awards of the good and the evil. "The upright shall dwell in the land . . . the wicked shall be cut off from it." "The righteous is delivered from trouble, the wicked cometh into it in his stead." This concerns award appointed, and not merely work done. "Behold, the righteous shall be recompensed in the earth, How much more the wicked and the sinner."

A man shall not merely possess useful things wrought by application; just wages shall be rendered to him. The house the wicked build, however strong it be, shall be overthrown, but the tent of the upright, however slight it be, shall flourish. "The evil bow before the good," because their riches are a crown to the wise. By the application of this principle, the six great arts, on which ancient civilization rested, were developed. Such application was not native to primitive man, and the insecurity of its reward in a primitive society would have been small encouragement. But, with the belief that diligence was God's requirement, exercised within his order and sure of his blessing, man could persevere. The religious interpretation of a reward is not read back into what man achieved otherwise, but was the spring of the achievement.

Five of these arts at least are referred to in the book, not merely as work of man's skill, but as embodiments of the principle of action and reward in its application to life. They are writing, agriculture, weaving, navigation, and the smelting of metals. Writing is the way of making instruction durable. "Have not I written unto thee excellent things of counsels and knowledge," which, moreover, are not to be written merely on wax tablets, but on the tablets of the heart. Agriculture is the constant illustration of how men, not merely have what they make, but reap what they sow. Refining of metals, possibly because it was a more recent art, but still more probably because it lent itself to the illustration of the deeper question of the goodness which concerns motive, appears frequently and with special originality in application. "The refining pot is for silver and the furnace for gold: and the Lord trieth the hearts." "Take away the dross from the silver and there cometh forth a vessel for the finer: take away the wicked from before the king, and his throne shall be established

in righteousness." The work of the weaver appears as an adornment of moral significance. Drowsiness shall clothe a man with rags, while in the active household the distaff and the spindle hold sway, and its members have warmth and splendor for themselves and something over to sell for their further needs, and distinction and respect when they appear in public. One of the four wonders of the world is the way of a ship in the midst of the sea; while the virtuous woman's capacity is like merchant ships which bring food from afar. The only art which does not certainly appear—for though cups are mentioned they may be of silver—is that which is most frequently used for illustration by the prophets, the humble art of the potter. This may be just because it was humble, and, therefore, not of sufficient dignity for the prosperity of the righteous, but the greater probability is that it did not illustrate the theme of the book, which is not that man has the article he makes, but the due reward of his deserving.

Its other achievement was law as something of a system or at least as a principle. Law is frequently mentioned, but not with certainty as state law. It seems always to be this law of equivalence between action and award which is in the nature of things. It is the law of the wise, of such people as prudent and discerning and experienced fathers and mothers, and is above all the judgment which they who seek the Lord understand. It attends to the whole conduct of life, and there is even a law of kindness of speech. To keep it is the essence of wisdom; and on this wisdom decent society, as well as personal blessedness, depends. "They that forsake the law praise the wicked: but such as keep the law contend with them," even as "he that keepeth the law, happy is he." But the wisdom of the Proverbs seems to have come down from the days when government was by the king, the princes and the nobles, acting rather by traditional justice than by legal codes. Yet the rule is right only as it embodies a law which is of God's counsel and relates action and reward with his equity. By God kings reign and princes decree justice, and nobles are to be righteous judges. The king especially embodies the majesty of this law, and is to be honored along with God as his representative in his essential task of legal justice. Yet even the king is safe only in so far as he carries it out with mercy and truth, and befriends only the wise. The princes are criticized still more freely. "For the transgression of the land many are the princes." And there is even more faithful dealing with rulers. "As a roaring lion and a ranging bear, so is a wicked ruler over a poor people." There is no doubt of the necessity

and value of good civic rule, but if the ruler does not embody in his rule the ultimate equivalence of action and reward, however he triumph for a time, the exactly just award of his acts awaits him also.

By the date of Proverbs reflection was long past the time when it was possible to think that Providence was occupied exclusively and effectively in assigning the exactly right material equivalents to mere outward actions. This led to deeper inquiry regarding the true nature of reward and to a wider formulation of the whole scope of action. All that is profoundest in the Book of Proverbs has to do with this rethinking of the scope of action and of award; and the fruit of this inquiry was such a deepening of moral insight as effected a new stage of human progress of the first importance.

True possession is distinguished from mere amassing. Security is in the golden mean which saves from the temptations both of want and of pride. Wealth brings social recognition, but character is a better security. The human element in reward is set above the merely material. Higher rewards than mere property are domestic peace, affection, friendship, the spirit of cheerfulness and moderation. Mere long life is still regarded as the natural reward of wisdom, and early and calamitous death of folly, but there is far more attention given to the quality of the living: and this is by no means measured merely by gain or pleasure. These blessings are further extended beyond the individual life. The good man is not expected to be in a position to need help, but he ought to find true joy in giving it. He has enlargement of spirit from seeing his prosperity and usefulness made secure on a sound moral basis, and he lives in his children, and in the honorable name he leaves behind. "A just man walketh in his integrity, blessed are his children after him," and "the memory of the just is blessed." In contrast, the wicked have an insecure prosperity, an uncertain lease of life, strife in their homes, hatred from their neighbors, bitterness in their own hearts—their fall is hailed with satisfaction, and their name rots. With this, there are fairly plain suggestions that virtue may be its own reward.

At the same time the idea of action is extended. Speech is a specially effective form of action, blessed in correction and instruction; and the deadliest evil is malignant slander and lying. Temper is also an effective form of action. "He that is slow to anger is better than the mighty," but "a wrathful man stirreth up contention" and suffers from it. And as God is the ground of this order, a very important difference in acting is gratitude and humility, or pride and arrogance. By this way the view is at last reached

that the real quality of action is the purpose and motive. "Keep thy heart with all diligence; for out of it are the issues of life," is not a pious generality but an assertion of what is ultimate in action and absolute as the measure of award. There are even proverbs in which desire occupies almost the same place as in Buddhism, such as: "The desire of a man is the measure of his kindness." "The desire of the righteous is only good," and shall be granted, whereas the desire of the wicked returns upon him as fear.

God's working is wisdom, and to know his ways is to be blessed by wisdom. It is not said that wisdom is God, but only that it dwelt with him from the beginning. Yet, as he fashioned all his creation by it, it is the sole and adequate interpretation of his ways. This interpretation by God's wisdom and man's rises at times both to beauty and sublimity, yet, when we take any description of this wisdom, as that in the eighth chapter, we see that what was with God as his master workman was just this exact adjustment of award to action. With its voice the whole earth resounds to all ready to give ear. It fixes the bounds of the earth and the sea; it makes firm the sky above, and appoints their places to the waters and the fruitful fields beneath; its all-pervading presence is the joy of the habitable world. Those who live by it inherit substance, for it fills their treasures; and they have life and favor of the Lord, and discernment to make profitable use of life and all its gifts. This is all plain to him that hath understanding, and right to them that find knowledge. To it wickedness is abomination; to sin against it is to wrong one's own soul; to hate it is to love death.

Many of these proverbs are very old, but not as old as the first application of this hypothesis to experience. Their peculiar gnomic ethical form may have been confined to Israel, but the same principle and the same kind of reflection on it were widely extended, and, in the end, the equivalence of award interpreted spiritually and action interpreted morally, determined the cosmology of all ancient civilization. Yet Job, though the most resounding challenge to this view of God and man, was not the first to question its adequacy, for all through the prophets runs a view of God's mercy and man's need and true service, which has passed far beyond it: and they neither sought visible reward nor obtained it.

In the ordinary relations of life, the principle is not without justification, especially in the fate of nations; witness Carlyle's *French Revolution* and Gibbon's *Decline and Fall*. In jurisprudence, progress has been mainly in taking more account of motive in action, and there is still much

to be done in seeing that punishment does not extend to final social and moral disaster. Even the requirement that law should be reformatory, and not a mere vindication of justice, is mainly a demand for a deeper justice which shall take account of opportunity: and no award would help to reform anyone, not recognized in some sense to be a just equivalent.

Nor have we wholly passed away from the idea that it ought to be true in the life of the individual. Most of the literary pessimism of the last generation wrought with the belief that it ought to be the standard of justice, and it is not. Even here something might be said in defense of it. Had the writer of Proverbs had the privilege of reading Hardy's *Tess*, for example, he would, I think, have said that she lacked the wisdom to discern the depths of right action and the highest quality of true award. The truly wise do not walk into temptation with their eyes blindfolded, nor do they take the reward even of wrong action with mere stupidity. The wise are the morally discerning, and there are disasters they do avoid. As a protest against harsh external human judgment Hardy is right and of the quality of Job, but as a judgment of God, it means stopping in revelation with Proverbs and never arriving at, "Now mine eye seeth thee" as having a purpose beyond outward good, and even altogether beyond our knowing.

Only on the higher level of spiritual service is the principle obviously inadequate, and, when read backwards, from the award to the action, it may, as Job shows, be mere smug injustice. The greatest who have given the hardest, best and most profitable service for others, have received for themselves not merely nothing, but positive hatred and wrong. Somehow they have their own reward, but the greatness of their service lay in disregard for any, and, if their work is its own reward, it is in another world from the world of the *Proverbs*, the world of the Servant of the Lord, who so found his reward in the good of others that he saw of the travail of his soul and was satisfied, and of Him who, for joy set before him in giving his life a ransom for many, endured the cross and despised the shame. Yet even this must be rising above, and not falling below, the discernment that the quality of action is of the soul and its reward in what exalts the soul to love and service. Beyond this, the prophets maintain and the whole teaching and life of Jesus affirm that the government of God is concerned with the reconciliation of his sinful children to himself, and not with a mere adjustment of award to action, and that the greatest work of his servants is to share with him in this task, even to bearing their sins and carrying their sorrows.

# The Significance of Jesus for Our Conception of God

FRANCIS PICKENS MILLER

FOR me Jesus defines Ultimate Reality. He defines it, not theoretically but actually, in terms of life and death and in terms of the New Society which sprang from belief in his resurrection. The primary object of this paper is neither to discuss *why* Jesus defines Ultimate Reality nor to consider *how* he defines it, but rather to consider what the definition *is* which he gives. My conviction is that if men stand in the presence of the Ultimate and Eternal Reality which Jesus defines, they will be driven to the conclusion that his definition is true, and they will discover that their conclusion will be confirmed by the logic of their minds as well as by the response of their hearts and their wills.

When I affirm that Jesus defines Ultimate Reality I do not mean this affirmation in the sense of the formula "God is like Jesus," because the likeness of the Christian God is defined both by Jesus and by what happened to Jesus, both by "the days of his flesh" and by the days that followed after the days of his flesh.

In other words, the definition which Jesus gives is a far more comprehensive definition than any which could be derived from even a complete record of his life between birth and execution were that available. As a matter of fact, the particular events which occasioned the rise of the Christian Movement and which inspired its mission were events which occurred after Jesus' death. And it is only when the events of his life are viewed in the light of these post-mortem events that the full significance of Jesus for our conception of Ultimate Reality can be appreciated.

An organic view of reality is essentially alien to the modern mind. We have been trained by the discipline of the scientific method to isolate facts and to treat them as if they possessed the property of "simple location," to use Whitehead's phrase. This predilection has greatly influenced our mental picture of Jesus. His full-length portrait has been replaced by a crudely truncated cartoon. To treat any person, but particularly Jesus, as if he possessed the property of "simple location," is to distort the meaning of personal life to such an extent as to render one's conclusions wholly

unreliable. The fact is that the life of Jesus is organically related to and hence in unbroken continuity with the events and movements which were the consequences of his life.

The definition of Ultimate Reality which I shall try to sketch is based on the assumption that the life of Jesus, religiously speaking, cannot be understood as an isolated historical incident, but that his life derives its deepest meaning from its organic connection with the lives of his contemporaries and also with the lives of those who came after him, including our own.

In asserting that Jesus defines God I do not mean to suggest that he defines him either in totality or in detail. His definition is a general definition of the essence of Ultimate Reality. It is an answer to the question, "What in essence is the relation between God and man, and what is God's will for man?"

What then are the data that supply the definition which Jesus gives of Ultimate Reality? These data include:

The religious history of the Jews leading up to Jesus.

The life and faith of Jesus.

The death of Jesus (viewed both from the standpoint of Jesus and from the standpoint of the society which destroyed him).

The belief that he rose again.

The New Society which grew out of that belief.

In this sense Christianity is not the religion of Jesus nor the religion about Jesus, but the religion created by men's worship of the Reality revealed throughout the drama of which Jesus was and is the central figure. What is the character of Ultimate Reality as defined by the data supplied by this drama?

They define Ultimate Reality in terms of Thou—of the Thou who Creates, of the Thou who Judges, of the Thou who Loves, and of the Thou who Accepts the full responsibility for and consequences of his Creation, his Judgment and his Love. I purposely refrain from defining Ultimate Reality as "personal" because the word "personal" has become so individualized in our Protestant vocabulary as to be incapable of conveying the concept of God contained in the New Testament. There is an advantage in using the simplest possible term to describe the One who is both "other" and "in relation to me," the Creator and Sustainer of all things visible and invisible and the One through whom I live and move and have my being.

In a day when impersonal concepts dominate thought and action (concepts of values, systems, processes, integrations, masses, machines, etc.)—when men worship an It rather than a Thou, this Christian affirmation has momentous consequences for our view of nature, of man and of human society.

The essence of the Ultimate Reality that is revealed to us in the Christian drama is that Jesus not only thought of himself as living in responsible relationship to a Thou, whom he called "his Father in heaven," but he believed himself to be an Act of this Thou. If we think of Jesus as an Act of Ultimate Reality then what he was, what his unbelieving contemporaries thought about him and did to him, and what his disciples believed and did, must all be taken into account in trying to understand the nature of God and the relation between God and his Creation and particularly between God and man.

These data contain the assumption that the Thou expresses himself through a Reign or a Realm. This Reign or Realm defines the grain of the universe, sets bounds to personal and social destiny and gives the decisive "yes" and "no" to history. From the standpoint of humanity this Reign of God is the social structure of Ultimate Reality with which men have to deal every moment of their lives. In one way or another they are continually accepting it or rejecting it. They either associate themselves with it or rebel against it. The lives of most of us are a curious amalgam of fealty and treason. In so far as we ignore or deny the Reign, there is death. They who take the sword shall perish by the sword. But in so far as we seek first the Reign of God and submit to its sovereignty there is fullness of life. The Christian accepts the Reign of God as the creative and redemptive Movement of Ultimate Reality in the Time Stream. He accepts it humbly as a penitent who stands under the Judgment of God but at the same time he accepts it with joy as a citizen of the Realm who has a chance to participate in the realization of God's eternal purposes.

It seems to me that the thought of our American liberal Protestantism is weakest at this point. We have believed in freedom—freedom to do good with unlimited material blessings as the reward of virtue, and freedom to do evil with no really serious consequences at all, since God is a kind and indulgent Father.

From the standpoint of the relative and the temporal there is obviously a margin of freedom (a much narrower margin than we have been ac-

customed to suppose), but from the perspective of the Absolute and the Eternal—what we usually call freedom (freedom in the sense of *self-expression*) loses its meaning, since every free movement away from the purposes of Ultimate Reality is a movement toward bondage and death. At the same time those whose lives are identified with the purposes of Ultimate Reality discover that by renouncing their own claim to freedom they achieve the only true freedom. They pass from death into life as they serve Him "whose service is perfect freedom."

I sometimes think that the Communists are going to teach us more truth about the relation between Ultimate Reality and history than our own theologians. However erroneous the theory of economic determinism may be, it represents a much closer approximation to truth than is possible for anyone to achieve who in the pride of his modernism has thrown overboard as superfluous baggage such antiquated concepts as those which deal with the sovereignty of God or with the doctrine of predestination.

Perhaps the time is coming when we may begin to understand a little of what Jesus meant when he said:

"Unless you submit to the Reign of God like a little child you will never get into it at all."

"The Reign of God is not coming as you hope to catch sight of it . . . for the Reign of God is now in your midst."

Of equal significance for our concept of Ultimate Reality is the tension revealed in these data between the Realm of God and the realm of man. Here again an essential Christian truth remains practically incomprehensible to the modern intellect. The very fiber of our minds has been colored by our belief in progress, and in many unconscious ways we tend to identify the best in contemporary civilization with the fulfilment or completion of the Reign of God.

Though as individuals we may imagine that we are emancipated from such superficial opinions, the fact remains that the chasm which the New Testament portrays between the ways of God and the ways of man is far deeper and wider than many of us find it possible to admit.

This chasm is the scandal of the Christian faith. It is perhaps an even greater scandal for us, enmeshed as we are in what Tillich calls the self-sufficient finitude of our scientific age, than it was for the Greeks in the first century. Yet the data which we are examining show immediate actuality and Ultimate Reality in continual conflict, the relative against the

Absolute, the temporal against the Eternal, selfish greed against Love, man against God, and the end of that conflict is the cross.

I do not suppose that this conflict will ever be resolved in Time. Wherever Ultimate Reality articulates itself clearly, whether in the first century or in the twentieth, there is the same utter antithesis between God's will and man's will as that which is revealed in Jesus' relations with his contemporaries. The corollary of this is that wherever a consciousness of this antithesis does not exist the God whom men are worshiping is almost certainly not the God of the New Testament.

In the Christian drama a moment came when it appeared that self-sufficient finitude had triumphed over Ultimate and Eternal Reality. Human society had declared war on divine society and won the victory. The cross is the symbol of God's destruction at the hands of men.

But the supreme paradox of the Christian faith is that the Cross had from the standpoint of Ultimate Reality very different consequences from those which the highest human intelligence could have anticipated. Humanly speaking, it was final evidence of an exploded myth. It shortly came to be a symbol of the redemptive love of the living God.

Jesus was dead. The end had come to all the hopes which he had aroused. Then to a few men and women there came the conviction that his death on the cross was not the end of his life. They became aware of his continued existence; an existence very different from the existence of the days of his flesh, but even more significant for them and for humanity. They began to realize that instead of being destroyed by death he had actually put an end to death and brought life and immortality to light. This was the foundation of their faith that God rather than man had the last word, and that in Jesus the Reign of God had triumphed over the reign of evil men. And this was the inspiration of their mission of "good news" to the rest of the world.

Thus the Crucifixion and Resurrection taken together on the one hand define the evil in man and in human society, and on the other hand define Ultimate Reality as possessing both the love and the power adequate not only to overcome man's evil purposes but even to use these evil purposes in the service of Ultimate Good. By faith in this love and in this power man himself becomes "a new creation" and devotes himself to the task of building a new society. It is through the cross and through the resurrection that men have acquired the belief that even in this present evil world they can

be reconciled to God and so participate here and now in the life of his Eternal Kingdom. "Except a grain of wheat fall into the ground and die it abideth by itself alone, but if it die it bringeth forth much fruit."

Out of this faith came the New Society (the Church) as the symbol in this world of that divine community which can only be perfectly realized in heaven. The Catholic thought that the church is the Extension of the Incarnation seems to be implied in several of the epistles. It is probably too much to expect that in our time the Protestant sects will undergo a transformation sufficiently profound to make them capable of impressing persons who are non-members as having significance for their concept of Ultimate Reality. But when the Church Invisible does become less invisible than it is now, men will no doubt look to its corporate life and faith for help in understanding the nature of that Reality, for it is uniquely in the fellowship of the Church Universal that men come to know the truth about God.

One conclusion to which the line of thought followed in this paper leads me is that, theologically speaking, the definition of Ultimate Reality given by the life and death of Jesus and by the events to which Jesus' life and death gave rise is most adequately expressed in the doctrine of the Trinity—Ultimate Reality in itself, revealed in the life of a person, and at work creatively and redemptively throughout all history. That concept is, I believe, the nearest approximation to the truth of which the mind of man is capable.

Another conclusion is that the material from which the Christian interpretation of Ultimate Reality is derived is *given* material. It is given by the history of the Christian drama—a drama which will continue to the end of time in the life of the Church Universal.

The closing paragraph of Schweitzer's *Quest of the Historical Jesus* has always seemed to me to be the final word as to what Jesus may mean to any one of us:

"He comes to us as One unknown, without a name, as of old, by the lake-side, he came to those men who knew him not. He speaks to us the same word: 'Follow thou me!' and sets us to the tasks which he has to fulfil for our time. He commands. And to those who obey him, whether they be wise or simple, he will reveal himself in the toils, the conflicts, the sufferings which they shall pass through in his fellowship, and, as an ineffable mystery, they shall learn in their own experience who he is."

# Paul as Christian Apostle and Jewish Rabbi

ALFRED E. GARVIE

## I

THE subject which I have chosen is not only of interest in itself, but of importance as illustrating the wider subject of the relation of God and man in revelation and religion, and to this wider aspect I wish at the start to refer, since the wider subject is one of urgent present relevance. There is the school of theology on the Continent—the Barthian—which has had some ardent advocates in other lands, but now seems to be breaking up as the Master has been excommunicating his disciples for departing from the truth—which so emphasizes God's activity in revelation as to reduce man in the reception of it to an impotent passivity, and consequently to deprecate man's activity in religion, not as a condition of, but as an obstacle to revelation. In the group movement also there is some teaching about *guidance*, which substitutes a direct divine guidance for the operation of the Divine Spirit through man's reason and conscience. To both these instances of a common tendency my study and reflection have led me to be entirely opposed. What I hold in common with this tendency is the affirmation of God's sole sufficiency and sovereignty and man's entire insufficiency and dependence; but the mutual relation of God and man is not omnipotence overwhelming impotence, but *grace* wooing and winning *faith*, an activity of God that does not reduce man to passivity, but evokes his activity. When Paul lays bare his inner life in the confession, "I have been crucified with Christ; yet I live; and yet no longer I, but Christ liveth in me," he appears in those words to teach an absorption of himself in Christ; but in the words that follow he makes clear that it is difference in unity, and not identity without difference that he is claiming: "that life which I now live in the flesh I live in faith, the faith which is in the Son of God, who loved me and gave himself up for me" (Galatians 2. 20).

May I here briefly state three considerations bearing on the general subject of God's relation to man, and no less on the special subject before us? (1) God does not treat men as puppets of his power, but as children of his heart; personal as he himself is so that all his action in them is personal,

respecting their personality—it is a mutual relation in which human activity responds to divine even as it receives it. (2) The misrepresentation of the relation, which is affirmed in Augustinianism and Calvinism, and negated in Pelagianism and Arminianism, is due to what I have elsewhere described as *spatial*, *mechanical*<sup>1</sup>, and *deistic* thinking. God is conceived as external to man, as acting like a physical force on man, and as so transcending as to be separated from man. But if in God we live and move and have our being, if we are his offspring (Acts 17. 28), not by a solitary act of creation, but by a constant process of conservation, the inadequacy of all such thinking is apparent. (3) As in human personality there is continuity in development, even conversion does not abolish any man's past, and give him a fresh start detached altogether from that past. To his own consciousness the convert may appear a "new creation; the old things are passed away; behold they are become new" (2 Corinthians 5. 17), yet a close psychological scrutiny shows that the past cannot be so annihilated, but, be the change ever so great, is continued into the present. However intense was Paul's consciousness of change through his faith in the grace of God in Christ, however intimate his communion with his Saviour and Lord, however fresh was his vision of truth in the new relation, his personal identity continued, and the Jewish Rabbi survived in the Christian Apostle, not only in the minor matters of his methods of quoting, interpreting, and drawing arguments from the Old Testament, but even in major matters of theology, which are by most persons regarded as integral parts of his interpretation of his experience of his redemption and reconciliation in Christ. There are parts of his theology, which largely belong to his Jewish inheritance, which under cover of his authority as a Christian apostle have passed into Christian dogmatics, and have even been given greater prominence and importance there than those parts which belong to his distinctive Christian experience. It is those parts with which I shall here be concerned, as a recognition of the distinction between the derived and the original elements of his complex and not always consistent theology would relieve the readers of his letters of many a difficulty. Much of the prejudice against the apostle would be removed if these distinctively Christian truths were detached from their context in Jewish thought, although much of that retains a permanent, if subordinate, value. The doctrines to which, for our present purpose, attention may be directed are those dealing with the Atonement, the Fall and Election, and the Last Things.

In regard to all these doctrines we can observe the emergence of what may be called the distinctively Christian experience of the apostle; we must recognize a development in the apostle's theology, not from a lower to a higher appreciation of the sufficiency of Christ as Saviour and Lord, for Paul's conversion was his crucial experience, in which was implicit all that afterward became explicit, but by a growing apprehension by him of what his relation to Christ involved.

There is in Paul's doctrine of the Atonement a permanent and a progressive element. The permanent element in his personal experience, as in his public ministry, was the Cross of Christ. "Far be it from me to glory, save in the Cross of our Lord Jesus Christ, through which the world hath been crucified unto me, and I unto the world" (Galatians 6. 14). "We preach Christ crucified, unto Jews a stumbling-block and unto Gentiles foolishness; but unto them that are called, both Jews and Greeks, Christ the power of God and the wisdom of God" (1 Corinthians 1. 23, 24). The salvation of man through the sacrifice of Christ—that was the constant element amid all change in Paul's thinking; and again and again has the Christian Church returned, of religious and moral necessity, to this central conviction.

But the theological interpretation has taken two complementary directions in answer to the two crucial questions: How can a sinner be forgiven? How can a sinner be made holy? Some minds are concerned with the one more than with the other. For Augustine deliverance from the bondage of sin was primary; for Luther the forgiveness of the guilt of sin. The word redemption expresses the one, reconciliation the other. The one is objective, concerned with God's moral authority; the other is subjective, interested in man's moral character. And theories of the Atonement have been distinguished as either objective or subjective. As I have indicated above, these tendencies are complementary, and not alternative, for so intimately mutual is the relation of God and man in Christ that a vindication of God's authority and a transformation of man's character cannot be opposed to one another. A man must recognize and respond to God's judgment on sin in his forgiveness if he is to be moved to repentance and amendment of his own life. I myself hold strongly the need of a theory of the Atonement that meets both demands as fully as our imperfect thinking on such a theme can. What I am trying to do now is not to doubt or deny the need of such an objective view as Paul presents in Romans 1-4; but rather to show how

in his presentation his method of argument is Jewish, and may even from his Christian standpoint demand some correction, whereas his confession in Romans 6-8 is distinctly Christian, and most congenial to many Christians.

The idea of *propitiation* in 3. 26 as the basis of the idea of *justification* by faith is a presentation of salvation from the standpoint of God as Law-giver, Judge, and Ruler—the current Jewish, Pharisaic idea—and not from the newly gained point of vantage of God as Father. Christianity does rightly inherit from “the ethical monotheism of the prophets” the belief in God’s righteousness, his dealing with men if need be by penalty for sin. The piety that ignores law, judgment, rule in God’s relation to man sinks to an ineffective sentimentalism, but the theology which does not transform these facts in God’s relation by the reality of God’s Fatherhood remains an external legalism. The venue of Romans 1-5 is the law-court and the argument is *forensic*; and Paul’s experience of grace robs it of logical consistency. He leaves the meaning of the term *propitiation* or *propitiatory* vague, except by indicating that somehow the Cross of Christ did show that God’s “passing over the sins done aforetime” was not due to moral indifference, and that God’s present forgiveness was somehow consistent with his righteousness as vindicator of his law (verses 25, 26). He does not, like the Reformers, here explain the death as a *penal substitution of Christ for sinners*. But this doctrine is suggested by the description of Christ as “having become a curse for us” (Galatians 3. 13), and as having been “made by God sin for us” (that is, treated as a sinner) (2 Corinthians 5. 21). He is forced to recognize the inadequacy of this external legalism; forgiveness as legal acquittal may fail to bring about moral renewal. “What shall we say then? Shall we continue in sin, that grace may abound? God forbid” (Romans 6. 1, 2). Probably Paul, no less than those whose opposition to his gospel he is seeking to overcome, felt the need of such a revelation of God as righteous Judge as a condition of the revelation of his forgiveness as Father. But it was the love of God as made effective in his experience of the grace of Christ by his faith uniting him personally to Christ to which he appealed as the motive of holiness. This personal union with Christ, which it is not necessary to describe as *faith—mysticism* as an inward transforming relation is what is distinctively Christian.

As I have already indicated, for a system of theology seeking to relate the gospel to the moral order of the world and the conscience judging the sinner as guilty before God, the objective doctrine of the Atonement is

necessary for logical completeness and consistency, but for many an individual believer this experience will be quite enough, and he need not do any intellectual violence to his reason if he finds it impossible to understand any theory of the Atonement. What the modern Christian theologian is called to do is to present the truth imperfectly expressed in Paul's argument, in relation to, and as modified by the truth of God's Fatherhood, his love as revealed in the grace of Christ. That holy love in Christ's Cross shares and in sharing approves the consequences of sin for man as the judgment of God in sin. The frequent moral weakness of what claims to be the evangelical type of Christian thought and life, the moral defect of much Lutheran theology, shows that the danger Paul anticipated and sought to avert in Romans 6. 1ff. is not imaginary, but real; the result of an inadequate presentation of the Gospel.

## II

Had this distinction which I am trying to justify between the Jewish rabbi and the Christian apostle been recognized, two of the great historical controversies would have been avoided: the Augustinian-Pelagian and the Calvinistic-Arminian. A closer scrutiny shows how little basis in the Holy Scriptures there is for the gigantic structure of Augustinianism and Calvinism. Except in the story of Genesis 3, the Old Testament does not explain man's sinfulness by the fall of Adam. The Apocrypha have two alternative explanations of the origin of sin in Adam's fall or in an evil tendency in human nature, and these may be harmonized by ascribing to Adam also that evil tendency. Jesus not once refers to the Fall. He assumes that men are sinners who need forgiveness and renewal, the lost who must be sought and saved. Paul does connect the entrance of sin into the world with Adam's transgression, but he does not explicitly refer man's sinfulness of nature to Adam's Fall (Romans 5. 12-21), but seems in his doctrine of the flesh to recognize an evil tendency (Romans 7. 7-25). The doctrine of natural corruption and total depravity rests on Augustine's misunderstanding of Paul, claiming as a certainty what the Greek text leaves ambiguous. The modern knowledge of racial evolution and individual development offers an alternative explanation of the origin of sin in the race and the individual, which we may accept without setting aside anything in Paul's teaching as Christian apostle; his views on the Fall and its consequences, whatever they may have been, belong to the Jewish rabbi.

This doctrine of the origin of sin is necessarily assumed in the doctrine of election, with which we are mainly concerned, as it affords an illustration of a gradual transformation of Paul's Jewish inheritance by his Christian experience.

While the conception of the divine sovereignty, which pervades the Old Testament, involves the inference that nothing occurs without divine appointment, yet are man's liberty and responsibility increasingly recognized; but it is within Christian theology that this inference has been systematically applied to the problem of individual destiny. God elects some to eternal life, others he predestines to eternal death. To the elect there is given irresistible grace so that their salvation is made sure; the non-elect have their damnation made certain not only by the withholding of grace, but by God's using Satan as an instrument of their ruin. While there are other references to election in the New Testament, it is in the argument in Romans 9 that this doctrine finds its broadest and firmest scriptural support. (1) In this use of Paul's teaching what is ignored is that it is an *argumentum ad hominum*; the apostle is rebuking the arrogant claim of the Jew that he was the elect of God, and that his unbelief of the gospel which Paul was preaching could not condemn him to rejection by God; and this the apostle does in terms familiar to the Jew, consistent with his conception of God. God as Creator can do what he pleases with his creature, and the creature has no right to complain of the action of the Creator. This is not the Christian conception of God, who desires all his creatures to become his children. It is even an immoral argument, for if the Creator be morally perfect, it is his moral obligation not to use his power over the creature for the worst, but for the best. (2) Paul's illustration of the potter gives away his argument. He would be a bad workman who used fine clay for any purpose for which coarser clay would serve; the skillful artisan will make the best use of his material. (3) What is still more inexcusable in the exegete is the detachment of the first step in the continuous argument from the last step, which really annuls the first. Paul goes on to show (chapter 10) that the unbelieving Jew, if reprobate, deserves what he gets, and there is not that arbitrariness in God's action, which he has claimed as God's right. He does not, however, stop there; the patriotic Jew is better than his Jewish theology. He cannot acquiesce in God's rejection of his chosen people as final, and despite logic, by the flight of love, he reaches the conclusion, "that a hardening in part hath befallen Israel, until the fulness of the Gentiles be come

in, and so all Israel shall be saved" (Romans 11. 25, 26); and he even generalizes the historical instance in the daring assertion: "God hath shut up all unto disobedience, that he might have mercy upon all" (verse 32). How is it that those who based their theology on chapter 9 so completely ignored chapter 11? Can there be any doubt that in chapter 9 it is the Jewish rabbi who is disputing with his unbelieving countrymen; in chapter 11 it is the Christian apostle who is aspiring after the higher and larger truth? While Paul not only here, but in other passages, retains his Jewish inheritance, he also elsewhere rises to this Christian universalism. In 1 Corinthians 15. 28, he anticipates the end "that God may be all things in all men." In Ephesians 1. 22, 23 the church, which is the body of Christ, and for the sake of which God gave him to be head over all things, is "the fulness of him that filleth all in all," or rather "the complement of him that is completing all things in all men." While Paul's teaching is ambiguous, as support can be found in his writings for the doctrines of eternal punishment and conditional immortality, yet whatever difficulties on account of man's liberty and responsibility and hence possible final resistance to God's grace which sin may offer may beset the doctrines, this universalism seems to be most congruous with the Christian conception of God; and Paul's authority can be invoked for it. I myself cannot dogmatically assert, but personally I cherish "the larger hope"

"Oh yet we trust that somehow good  
Will be the final goal of ill,  
To pangs of nature, sins of will,  
Defects of doubt, and taints of blood;

"That nothing walks with aimless feet;  
That not one life shall be destroyed,  
Or cast as rubbish to the void,  
When God hath made the pile complete."

(In Memoriam.)

### III

We now pass to a change of thought which is more immediately related to Paul's own personal experience. There can be no doubt that Jesus in his teaching took over the Jewish eschatology; and that his language regarding the last things was affected by Jewish apocalyptic. The term so often on his lips, the Son of Man, cannot be detached from *Daniel* and *Enoch*, although he put into it the content of the Suffering Servant of the

Deutero-Isaiah. How far in his own thought that language was but a convenient symbol of more spiritual truths we cannot tell, but we must always qualify the language he borrowed by his own unique and distinctive consciousness of himself as Son and God as Father. There seems to be no doubt, however, that Jesus anticipated a speedy return to the disciples. The Early Church was dominated by this Jewish eschatology or apocalyptic. The difference between its hope and the Jewish was that for Christian faith the Messiah had come, and was again coming in power and glory as the central actor of the imminent drama of the divine providence. That Second Advent was expected shortly, within the life-time of the first believers. In 1 Thessalonians Paul is comforting the mourners for those who had died before that blessed consummation with the assurance that "them also that are fallen asleep in Jesus will God bring with him" so that they "that are alive . . . shall in no wise precede them that are fallen asleep" (4. 14, 15). In 2 Thessalonians he seeks to restrain the excitement which the expectation of a speedy return of Christ was encouraging by very perplexing teaching about a necessary delay till the Man of Sin has been exposed and destroyed (2. 6-12). In 1 Corinthians 15. 20-58 he describes that drama, Christ's Second Advent, the general resurrection, and the final judgment, the fulfilment of the Father's purpose through the Son, and reckons himself among the living witnesses. "We shall not all sleep, but we shall all be changed, in a moment, in the twinkling of an eye, at the last trump" (verses 51, 52). In so late an epistle as Philippians he seems still to cherish that hope. "Our citizenship is in heaven; from whence also we wait for a Saviour, the Lord Jesus Christ; who shall fashion anew the body of his glory" (3. 20, 21).

But in 2 Corinthians an alternative expectation is presented. The apostle had been dangerously ill, nigh unto death, and so he was confronted with the prospect of what would immediately follow death. That question had not been raised for his mind in the assurance he gave the mourners in Thessalonica. It became acute for him personally. His solution is, that absence from the body is presence with the Lord, and that the soul will not be left unclothed, but "clothed upon with the habitation which is from heaven, a building from God, a house not made with hands, eternal in the heavens" (5. 1-4). The resurrection follows on death immediately, and blessedness with Christ is at once attained. What meaning and value remain for a general resurrection at Christ's Second Advent, it may be after

many days, and the full blessedness to be attained after the final judgment? Paul does not explain the inconsistency, and probably was not conscious of it himself. Desperate have been the attempts to preserve the Jewish eschatology by the assumption of an intermediate state, different, however, for saints and sinners; yet logic demands that for both it should be disembodied, not the recovery of the whole personality.

The working creed of most Christian believers has been that the wicked go to hell, and the righteous to heaven at death, which is thus the occasion of final judgment. The candid and the courageous course is to abandon this Jewish eschatology altogether in its literalness, which raises insuperable difficulties for our thought, to preserve only what is expressed there in imperfect symbol, but remains valuable as consistent with the Christian conception of God, namely, that not a disembodied soul, but the full personality, spirit with spiritual body, survives, that death is the occasion of judgment on this earthly life, so that hereafter men shall reap as they have sown here, that that judgment need not be assumed as final as God's dealings in grace may still continue, and that the individual destiny will be determined by holy love, not excluding but transcending righteous judgment. It is significant that Paul should have thus experienced the inadequacy for his Christian faith of the Jewish eschatology which he retained, and should have suggested, in obscure terms, an alternative hope which is more satisfying, and more consistent with the distinctively Christian conception of God's relations to men.

#### IV

These are the conspicuous illustrations of this gradual process of transformation in the apostle's mind of the Jewish rabbi into the Christian apostle. A recognition of this living change will not detract from, but increase the interest of the study of the apostle's epistles, which so closely and vividly reproduce the course of his life and thought. His thought waited upon his life, his doctrine upon his experience; he did not in an abstract intellectual process think out the necessary changes in his thought, which his experience of Christ as Saviour and Lord involved; but life was his teacher, as the immediacy of the relation between his doctrine in 2 Corinthians and his experience at the time most distinctly shows.

This personal instance justifies us in the more general conclusion that we must not treat the New Testament as a textbook of a theology super-

naturally imparted by God to men, but as a record of a revelation conveyed through religion, God speaking to men through men, inspiring the men that through them he might convey the message. We must use the New Testament, not dogmatically but historically, not as a storehouse of proof-texts, but as a treasury of personal experience, and of doctrine conveyed; not apart from, but in the course of that experience.

As has been already urged God treats his messengers as persons, and not puppets, and thus the conveyance is affected not only by the natural capacity, but also by the intellectual endowment, moral character, and religious experience of the organ of revelation. The Word always becomes flesh; as in the Incarnation so in all revelation God assumes human nature into unity with himself, and however divine the content, the form is human.

One last consideration, not mentioned at the beginning, I would now add. God is one, and there is continuity in his method in nature and history, Creation, Providence, Revelation, and Redemption. In his progressive creation he uses the content of the lower stage of that evolution as a condition of the higher; he associates the creative product with the creating process. Chemical and physical processes are assumed in vital, and vital in mental; in man the animal survives, even though transcended. Old things pass away and all things become new even in the creation of grace, because the old are not destroyed, but without violence to their nature transformed, and the old transformed makes possible the new. The Christian apostle would not have been what he was, nor could God have used him as he did, had not the Jewish rabbi survived, while being transformed.

This human limitation to which God can descend in his revelation has its compensation in the intelligibility and attractiveness of his Word to men; the truth, embodied in a tale, can enter in not only at lowly doors, but at all doors. Browning has beautifully expressed this law of compensation in his poem *Deaf and Dumb*, bringing out the significance of a Group by Woolner.

"Only the prism's obstruction shows aright  
The secret of a sunbeam, breaks its light  
Into the jewelled bow from blankest white;  
So may a glory from defeat arise;  
Only by Deafness may the vexed Love wreak  
Its insuppressive sense on brow and cheek,  
Only by Dumbness adequately speak,  
As favoured mouth could never, through the eyes."

(Vol. VI, p. 151.)

# A Theology of Disillusion

FRANK KINGDON

Newark, N. J.

"A long time ago the world began  
With heigh-ho! the wind and the rain."

**A**N almost equally long time ago, or so it seems, we were in the cozy twilight of Victoria's long reign. The air still echoed with the titanic debates between the Hebrew conjurer, Disraeli, and the wizard of Hawarden, Gladstone. Although they had fought implacably, everyone had the satisfaction of knowing that neither had ever been less than a gentleman. There were still gentlemen in the world when Victoria died.

In the shadow cast by her departure there were lighted in the drawing-rooms the candelabra of the Edwardian era. Everyone was brilliant for all had learned where the light fell on them to the best advantage. The old giants had passed from Westminster but there was still Arthur Balfour left and none could think the world less than elegant while he listened to the charming aridity of that impeccable accent drawling sophisticated doubt. It is true that a wild man had come out of Birmingham, but even his wit and bite decorated themselves with an orchid and looked out on the world through a monocle. When Edward died the proletariat were still paying the gentlemen that highest form of flattery which is imitation.

It really was a "very parfait" world. The King was a gentleman, the statesmen were all gentlemen, the Czar of Russia was a gentleman and even the President of the United States was a gentleman, too, although he was a rather stout one and only an American gentleman, which means a gentleman of not quite the vintage of Mayfair. But God was a good honest English gentleman. In fact, in some quarters, it was rumored that his family tree went even farther back than William the Bastard and 1066. However that might be, he admittedly incorporated in his being all the traditions of Oxford and classical learning. In fact, at an earlier date, in response to Napoleon's assertion that God is always on the side of the heaviest battalions, Wellington had made the crushing rejoinder that he was an old boy of one of England's public schools and that Waterloo was guaranteed by the playing fields of Eton. God was the Great British Sportsman and we could all count on his activities being cricket.

This was the spiritual milk on which most of us were nourished. If we played the game God would play it too, and since he held all the equipment and also wrote the rules, we could not lose when he was on our side. We could assure ourselves a satisfactory life if we behaved like godly gentlemen. In case of vulgar exhibitionism on the part of other peoples there was always the Palace at the Hague, a magnificent building, sir, donated by a Scotsman, and besides, we could always build another battleship and thus be ready to come up to the help of the Lord against the mediocre. Virtue was its own reward and if we were good boys and girls Santa Claus would come at Christmas. God was in his heaven and all was right with the world. Blessed be Christianity and the nations it has prospered. It was all idyllic. It was all beautiful. It was all superbly moral. And it was all a lie.

The war came and many gentlemen died. The saddest casualty was the passing of the grandest gentleman of all, for God was murdered in 1914. He probably never reached France but died of a pierced heart while on his way. I am sure, however, that he died, for, if he had really been alive and God, he would have struck with the lightning of silence upon the lips of men who blasphemously taught hatred in his name and recruited men for murder by the invocation of the Cross. The God of our fathers could not be alive in the world at war. He had been the guardian of the manly and the true, yet here were boys with whom we went to school, idealists and pure in heart, blown to pieces by the hundred thousand and mercifully treated only when they were allowed to die.

Where was God for those four years? Did any man see a bright form in the night moving among the myriad harvest of twisted bodies in the mud? Men told me once that he was a Christlike God yet he was not in Flanders. Would Jesus of Nazareth, gifted with the power of God, have looked indifferently on while men groaned with the agony of ebbing life on frozen ground under a winter sky with the wind coming from the north? I think not. He who could not sit patient in a synagogue with a withered hand before him would have forded every ocean and leaped every mountain to stay the pain of Europe if he had had the power of God. Why was not God there to bring his mercy? There is only one answer. He was dead. The father of the fatherless did nothing as children were robbed of father and food when both were needed most. The husband of the widow lifted no hand when home and possessions were wiped away. The good shepherd

was not there when the sheep turned into wolves and preyed on one another's vitals. The father came not running when his children cried.

One of two facts must be true. Either God was false to himself or else he died. I think he died. I know that God died in many hearts and I think he died in mine. The God of the world at ease was the Great Illusion and when we found him out there came the cosmic disillusion and we are left groping for a theology to match our disillusionment.

Those who tried to teach me theology used to tell me that we must begin our theology with man. The mistake of the older theologians, they said, was that they began with God and then deduced the nature of the universe from him. So, they said, we will begin with man. There is something to be said for their position. It is, at least, beginning with a fact of which we have immediate evidence. It is honest, but it is not likely to be comforting if it is too honest for I think a good case can be made for the assertion that mankind is Nature's most tragic mistake.

The jungle is ordinarily accepted as the world's most cruel center. We have made "the law of the jungle" synonymous with unfeeling action, yet the jungle, "red in tooth and claw," is gentle and reassuring compared with mankind on the loose. The lion tears his prey limb from limb, the tiger and the elephant fight their blind infuriated duels, the snake strikes its victim and devours voraciously and the bird of prey drives talons of steel into quivering flesh. It is all fierce and relentless. Yet while it is doing and when it is done the stars still shine overhead, the trees keep on growing, there is the music of streams running over stones and the little flowers carpet the floor of the forest with fragrant loveliness. When the jungle deed is done there is still the infinite peace of growing things. Let men fight, however, and there is no such pity out of their struggle. They kill not as the beast kills, one foe at a time, but number their murders by the hundred thousand. In the presence of ten million human corpses the jungle has a right to preen itself upon its mercifulness and to thank God it is not as civilization nor even as these humans.

Not only do men kill thus mathematically but in the process they wipe out every beauty of the earth on which they battle. The stars are blotted out by the smoke of their guns, the trees are splintered and killed by their shells and their poisons, the streams are polluted with their filth when they are not choked with their dead and, on the ground at their feet, "the flow'rs of the forest are all wede awa'." In the wake of death man leaves the ugly

and intolerable waste of desolation. Not among all the beasts and birds is there any that combines ingenuity and madness in such diabolical combination as this waster of his kind and his environment that we call man. He is the ultimate tragedy of creation.

Even in peace his work is only less destructive than in war. He spoils the mountains and the forests to build his cities and then allows these piles of what once was beauty to become breeders of dirt, disease and crime. He robs the bowels of the earth of their coal and metals, crushing, crippling and killing men to do it and then using the materials mined to create new weapons of greed and slavery and war. He turns the banks of rivers into ugly howling tenements of merchandise and even when Nature touches his spirit with a sudden and majestic glory he turns her work into a circus ground, introducing his blatant idiocies into the picture until the marvel itself is almost lost behind his commercial monstrosities. Instead of an island washed by the stirring sea, a city clogged with slums; instead of a hill-side clad in a robe of vegetation, a pile of slag overshadowing miners' hovels; instead of gold, money; instead of iron and copper and coal, an assembly line, a hideous factory and a gun; instead of a river of water, a stream fetid with the wastage of industry; on the rim of the Grand Canyon, a hot-dog stand—these are man's achievements. This is the progress of which he boasts and here, we are told, we must begin to think theology. Is it any wonder it must be a theology of disillusion?

Karl Barth has cut the Gordian Knot of disillusion by denying this premise of modern theology. Man, he says, is the illusion and only God is real. He appeals from the will o' the wisp of time to the white light of eternity. In his most quoted phrase he asserts that "there is an endless qualitative difference between time and eternity." We are like men holding the end of a rope that does not exist. Our experience, which seems so real to us, is not real at all but only an affectation of the senses. Reality is of another stuff. We cannot pass from man to God, indeed we cannot know him at all until and unless he breaks through the deception of our own experiences and reveals himself to us in his own way and on his own terms. If I may quote Barth again: "The truth and worth of the testimony of Christ lie in that what in them happens to the man happens from God; not what he is as a man, nor what he makes of it." This fundamental idea underlies his interpretation that when Paul wrote to the Corinthians he based his approach on the fact that in Corinth the testimony of Christ was

"threatening to become an object of energetic human activity, a vehicle of real human needs." In even plainer terms he writes, "All men with their self-thinking are liars."

This, at least, has the virtue of being on the human side thorough disillusion. It denies man as man any value and his self-consciousness any reality. Such a theology has its points. Confronted with the agony of human suffering it may be appalled and even moved to pity but it is saved from taking it at its face value or from attributing to its cosmic significance. It is intent on higher things. This is not all, for Barth has shown the potential heroism of his position in his refusal to bow the knee to Hitler, who represents merely that power of men which is not able to touch the essential life that is hid with Christ. Barth declares the escape of man from experience into God.

His difficulty for me lies in his too easy magic. I have never been able to convince myself that a wave of the magician's wand of phraseology could make evil disappear. To call evil "error" has never rid me of the fact itself. The experience is the same whether called by its name or its nickname. Similarly, to denominate consciousness as "a lie" does not get rid of it. If we decide to live, living is the same tough problem whatever we call it. The fields of Flanders, the humiliation of Germany over ten years, the stunted bodies of ill-born children, our own folly and mistakes, may all be mere ugly stains upon an artificial texture but they are still, in our experiences, horrid and full of pain. Our painting and sculpture, our new skills, our higher learning, the writing of such a paper as this, may be pitiful manifestations of inadequate minds attempting to create ineffectual structures of beauty and truth out of fugitive unreality, but they represent an actual effort of the only kind we can attain to express ourselves in the only forms we actually know. Man may be a liar building a world of deceptions but he is more sinned against than sinning, if he is, for these deceptions are the only truth he knows.

This certainly provides no ground of confidence in God. After all, the world was his idea, not ours, and we, the most complex products of the world, are presumably as he made us. It is quite conceivable to me that an omnipotent being might exist who would set beings going whose consciousness was a lie and whose actions would result in the bitter tragedy that marks humanity, but I would not call him a Christlike God. He could be nothing but the essence of mischievous malevolence. Thus does Barth come out

at a doubly dark disillusionment. Beginning with the denial of man he is bound to emerge, if he be logical, with an omnipotent Mephistopheles laughing behind the scenes.

The Buchman groups have tried a not dissimilar unraveling of the dilemma of disillusion. The trouble, they complain, is "sin." Man creates his own tragedy through his assertion of his will to evil. He chooses the darkness rather than the light. This is not the denial of consciousness but the magnifying of it to the terrible point where its action can deny the will of God and lay waste the world. Essentially, however, it lays all the blame on man, calling his effort "sin" rather than "a lie" but accepting the doleful fact that he is not one to be trusted. He is not good but God is, which is not much different from saying he is not real but God is.

This position is not as rigorous as the Barthian, probably because it has never commanded a first-rate intellect, but it also has its points. It has resolved for many individuals the inner conflict which caused them unhappiness and a sense of futility. It has developed certain techniques of spiritual catharsis which have enabled some types of temperament to rid themselves of inner guilt feelings by exposing them. It has also been instrumental in reviving interest in mystical experiences which bring a sense of cosmic invigoration to those suffering from the anemia of dependence. Buchman, like Barth, tells men to escape from their failures into God, but, unlike Barth, he makes their choice of God an act of their own volition.

Buchman's God is a little more comforting than Barth's for he gives man a chance to blaze his own trail to him, but he is not much of an improvement. Again we have to remind ourselves that man is as God made him, which means that "sin" is God's idea. On the whole, theologians have been rather brave about sin with their arguments maintaining that it is a fact but a necessary one in a moral world. I can sympathize with them to a large extent but their claim does not seem to me to carry through. It is good enough for the sins of an individual, perhaps, but inadequate for those of a generation. The past twenty years are too heavy a load for this ethic. Who would dare assert that the suffering of these days is repaid by the extra moral insights men have attained? Perhaps we can imagine an eternally moral Deity turning loose a race of morally half-blind creatures equipped with immeasurable resources for doing each other harm to watch the race in their experiences between moral development and disintegration, but he could never be described as a saving God—a scientist, perhaps, but never a

savior. It seems to me a cosmic disillusion of a peculiarly exquisite character to look upon the shame and torment of men and to explain them away as having meaning, not so much for the men themselves as for the Absolute in the dim recesses of his moral being. God then becomes a voracious preying spirit who feeds upon man's struggle and is fulfilled in man's agony.

Brightman has dared to confront not man but God with disillusion. He holds fast to the idea that we must interpret the world through personality, which means accepting man as he is and making God in his image. This puts not only struggle but the kind of conflict we know within ourselves at the heart of the universe. The important fact about it is not that God is limited merely but that he has in his own being that which is not submissive to his moral will. The Given is not godly but at enmity with the eternal good-will. God is not now Christlike as we use that term but he is struggling to be, and some day he may overcome his inherent weakness and go on to perfection. The world as it now exists is a product of his self-expression to date and it is full of pain and weariness precisely because it is the reflection of one divided and struggling in his own being.

There are certain braveries about this interpretation. In the first place, it does not dodge the fact of evil. It does not sprinkle the intoxicating perfumes of soft words over the rank areas of wrong and think them cured because they are covered or deodorized. Evil is evil, says Brightman, and as a fact it has as much right to be recognized as any other fact, so let us build our world including it. It is a fact, not only for God's perception, but of his nature and he knows it as we know it. In the second place, Brightman dares to be logical about the concept of personality as a basis for personalism. Personalists have a way of emphasizing the inclusiveness of personality as a concept which enables them to combine the paradoxes of identity and change and time and consciousness, but they have been loathe to recognize its exclusiveness, that is, its sense of being other than its world and so able to observe it; certainly they have not given full recognition to its connotation of conflict, that is, to the fact that it knows itself in its choices, which is another way of saying, in its own conflicts. Brightman does not dodge this issue but carries the warfare of the will right up into the being of God. In the third place, this theology gives a new glow to the moral struggle itself for it makes it have meaning both for the man and for God. Our warfare is for a better world and there is a sort of cosmic majesty about even the falling of a bird when we can see in it the participation of God and through

it the emancipation of God. The whole theology has tremendous implications of splendid activity for social reconstruction. Its God is at least no God of escapes.

In fact, Brightman's God is a very human deity. This makes him understandable and appealing. His chief difficulty, however, lies in the very fact of his humanness. We have already seen how sorry a mess man can make out of himself and his world. Suppose God is equally unfortunate. Which is really the ultimate, God or the Given? It would be an eternal tragedy to discover that what we call God is merely the cosmic good intention of one actually unable to put his better nature in control. I can conceive that the world is the fumbling self-expression of a mighty Creator not fully in control of himself, the attempt of a restless Spirit to find peace through activity, and I am even willing to admit that this idea of an imperfect world being the reflection of a divided personality at its source comes near to fitting some of the facts, but I cannot fail to see that it is a theology of disillusion, substituting the somewhat tenuous hope of eventual perfection for the absolute certainty which religion has usually claimed. If we use the word "God" in the traditional sense, then Brightman's God is a god on probation, potentially a success he is also potentially a failure, and we have to take a chance on the outcome. Religion thus becomes the mustering of heroism for the great gamble.

Niebuhr takes a long look at the world and shudders. He then offers us his alternative: a frank acceptance of the contradictions and compromises of the active world or the retirement into a monastery as an assertion that the way of Christ is an altogether different way seeking other values than those of our present living. This alternative in itself emphasizes a distinction that has peculiar validity for Niebuhr, that between the individual man and men gathered together into societies. One man may in his heart be tolerably ethical but men moving in groups live by lower moral standards. Organized social activity, whether in corporation, community or nation, still proceeds by the acceptance of practices men have rejected in their private lives. If, therefore, we are to be effective we must recognize this and be willing to accept the contradictions and make the compromises necessary to get results which seem to us good.

This position has the advantage of providing an illuminating critique of social action. Ordinarily we have assumed co-operation to be almost a good in itself and have taken as one measurement of progress the growth in

size of social units. It is well to have someone stop us to point out the dangers of group-development. Unless our groups are controlled they, by virtue of the intensification which social pressure puts upon human characteristics, become even more serious threats against human weal than individual action could ever become.

Man as an individual is a pretty decent creature but man in society is a peculiarly dangerous one, therefore individual men who want a better society must accept the inevitable, go as far as they can in improving the world by good means but stand ready to carry their goals if necessary by any means that are effective. This is not so much a disillusion with men or with God as with activity itself. It makes our ends so conditional on the kind of world in which we live that it settles for us the way we choose to accomplish that which we desire. The question raised is an acute one. It is something like this: Can we proceed on the assumption that action which is nobly motivated and carried out with the highest possible (this is a safeguard against the charge of perfectionism) regard for ethical integrity has an extra effectiveness for that very reason, or must we accept the opportunism of events, develop skills in handling it and pit our minds at a practical level against those of men who work without scruple to gain their ends? In traditional language, are the weapons of the spirit more powerful than those of the flesh? I do not find it difficult to see this world through Niebuhr's eyes as an area in which forces of life and death are struggling in material terms for the control of these resources which give men power in the actual management of affairs. Temperamentally, I am drawn strongly to participation in that struggle for I am impressed by the observation that men are what they are because of the kind of society in which they live. Nevertheless, I see that this position has theological implications of a specifically clear tendency.

It is a commonplace to remark on the fact that emphasis on the practical social situation is likely to drive men to the right theologically as they move to the left socially. This, however, does not satisfy the whole picture. What it virtually means is that men hold God as a moral and an inspiring ideal but that they do not expect him to play an active, let alone a determining, part in the struggle of life for truth and justice. He brings no accretion of validity to ethical action. Therefore, action has to find its own level. This is disillusion, in the sense of an inability to recognize the practicability of any absolute controls of behavior, carried to a logical con-

clusion that is undeniable but also devastating. It really means that the Cross is a magnificent display of loyalty to an absolute principle but also a demonstration of the ultimate futility of such an attitude.

Here, then, are four types of theology dominant in our day which illustrate four kinds of disillusion—Barth, disillusion with the reality of human experience; Buchman, disillusion with the goodness of man; Brightman, disillusion with the idea of the omnipotent and benevolent Deity; and Niebuhr, disillusion with the whole ethic of activity. What do they mean? I think that they probably indicate an underlying skepticism of the whole possibility of any absolute coming to terms with our common life. Barth has his Absolute but removes him from the frame of reference of time. Brightman discards the Absolute altogether. Niebuhr allows no validity to any absolute canon in human behavior. The question therefore arises: Can we have a theology on such terms? The answer is in the affirmative in a sense for we can obviously describe either an Absolute God or a Relative God. But there we stop. Our Absolute God, on Barth's terms, automatically precludes any deductions in terms of human life for he assumes human consciousness to be a lie. It is impossible to make any deductions from a Relative God for all deductions from that which is itself relative are necessarily only relative deductions. This is our contemporary theological cul-de-sac.

The emasculation of God represented by these theologies of disillusion may indicate any of three facts about us. We may be extraordinarily realistic and courageous, thus proving ourselves willing to face a disorganized world more honestly than our fathers. Or the whole concept of religion may be what Freud calls it, The Great Illusion, and we may be coming to that realization by easy stages. Or the present activity may be simply a process of revitalization through sloughing off some older and outworn modes of religious thinking.

Our generation is the last one for which I should be willing to make any claim of superior sanity. As a matter of fact, it seems to me to be rather an unusually neurotic one, still suffering from the shell-shock of one social disaster piled on another. History may pass a favorable judgment upon us but on the surface of events I should say that the likelihood is that we are a trifle mad.

As for the passing of religion, it seems to me that we shall consider its possibility only as long as we confuse religion with theology. The two are

closely related, so closely that it is impossible to think of the one without the other, but the saving fact about them is that our religion has always been better than our theology; better in the sense of being more alive as a whole man is more alive than any fraction of him. Theology is the intellectual fraction of religion set off in congealed isolation. It is a desiccated essence of what once was life. Theologies die, but that essential issue of aspiration, awe and dreams that is religion lives while men live.

The third explanation is probably the true one. Men pass from certainty to doubt to disillusion to wondering to new certainty again. All new affirmations are approached through narrow corridors of dark denial. Our lines are cast in an hour when old forms are inadequate. We are a generation of Aristophanes. The passing of the old is a promise of the emergence of the new. Our disillusionment is not merely an epilogue, it is also a prelude. When we come out of the shadow we shall find a world more changed than some men dare to think but also more familiar than perhaps any of us expect.

## Some Ideals of Education in Religion

FREDERICK C. GRANT

PERHAPS we ought to begin by asking, why try to teach religion at all? Isn't religion something that has to do with "the individual in his solitariness," as the philosopher Whitehead affirms? Isn't religion "caught rather than taught," as Dean Inge puts it? At most, isn't religion learned at home, rather than at church, as the theologian Schleiermacher insisted? Why then all this organized effort of religious education in our day? And is it effective? Does it really succeed in teaching religion? Do children grow up to read and reverence the Bible as a result of modern religious education? Do they, in fact, actually know the Bible any better, or attend church any more regularly, or take more interest in religion, than their grandparents did, for example? On the other hand there are those who ask, What is the value of knowing the Bible? Isn't it possible to know the Bible and still not be religious? Is there any direct connection between knowing the Bible and living a religious life? The Old Testament, for example: Is the Old Testament any more inspired, or inspiring, than the literature of ancient Greece—or than our own English literature? Why study the Bible, the literature of an ancient people who lived under conditions vastly different from ours, and never dreamed of the problems we face to-day? Why not teach ethics instead? But then is it so certain that teaching ethics to boys and girls will necessarily result in ethical behavior? Doesn't there have to be an innate, inner desire to do right, before we can inculcate the principles of right conduct? And the same is true of religion: Can you make anyone religious by teaching him about religion? Doesn't he either have to be born with a religious inclination, or else have to catch the inspiration from someone else?—And so we come back to about the point from which we started: Can religion be taught? Must it not rather be "caught"?—as Doctor Inge observed.

### I

Now these questions, that run around a complete circle and come back to where they began, have opened up a rather wide territory for discussion —like the pivoted direction-finder on the top of Mount Washington that

swings around the whole horizon, and takes in all the peaks and ranges in the neighborhood. I do not propose to answer them all. They are in the minds of many persons to-day: clergy, church-school teachers, parents, social workers—all persons, in fact, who take seriously the problems we face in this generation and who are hoping for some kind of solution before it is too late. We have our own answers to these questions; and our answers shape our policies. Not all our answers can be right; otherwise the questions would no longer be asked, and the Christian Church would march steadily forward upon a fully agreed program, to which everyone adhered.

We look back to the past, and wish, sometimes, life were as simple to-day as it used to be. We all know things have changed, especially since the beginning of the twentieth century; and the church, and the Christian religion, are caught in this flood tide just as surely as are the other institutions and inherited practices of men. I have recently read Ernest Poole's new novel, *One of Us*, which depicts this torrential change as it has affected the life of a quiet New England village. The fact that I spent the summer in that village makes only the more vivid to me the reality of the changes he describes: they are clearly enough and powerfully enough portrayed to impress every reader, whether he ever lived in Franconia or not. And yet life was not all simplicity, even in the eighties, and religion was faced with problems—somewhat different in kind, but just as real as those that confront it to-day. So I am not sure that to abandon our present projects and methods, and go back to the Bible and the catechism (as one or two of my friends propose doing), is the best solution of our difficulties. At the same time, it seems highly desirable to sit down quietly and think out what it is we are really trying to do. We people who are interested in Religious Education are sometimes accused of overstressing methods and forgetting aims, and of getting so completely entangled in our own jargon and terminology that we neglect the larger issues—the whole purpose, in fact, for which education in religion is undertaken. The aim, no doubt, is much the same as it was when our grandmothers taught Sunday-school classes. The methods we use, and the materials, are different. Perhaps we have not their confidence in a knowledge of the Bible, or in an accurate memorizing of the catechism. But the ultimate aim, a life united to God, humbly obedient to his will, honest and upright in the sight of men—that aim, which can scarcely be improved, is, let us hope, still ours.

We cannot set back the hands of the clock, and pretend that nothing has happened during the forward march of time. But at least we can see our problems more clearly. Perhaps too much stress is laid upon the problems, these days. Life is so much more complicated than it used to be! Not just religion: but all of life—business, politics, economics, education. For one thing, the world is getting over the effects of a great war, one that involved practically every nation of mankind. If anyone thought, in 1914, or in 1917, that the War would solve any problems, or settle any issues, he has certainly had cause to re-think his views since then. The war raised a hundred problems for every one it settled. It sowed dragon's teeth—for every tooth there has sprung up a new monster to torment and terrify mankind. No clearer proof of the utter futility of war could be provided than we have had since the Armistice in 1918. Truly, an armistice! For the war has gone on, ever since, not against Germany and Austria but against barbarism and selfishness, greed, and the whole pack of anti-social forces that have come out of their jungle to ravage civilization and if possible undo the long toil of centuries.

One of the most certain facts about our problem is that religion cannot be isolated. You cannot conduct religious education in a vacuum. The child to be educated religiously is faced with tasks which take all his interest and energy, as he grows up—chiefly the task of earning a living, and finding a place for himself in society. How is he to go about this? And what has religion to do with it? Will it help him, or hinder? Will it provide him the key to unlock the mysteries of life as he finds it, and solve the complicated problems that confuse him? Or will it only handicap him and mislead him, and in the measure in which he responds to it unfit him in the struggle for existence? You don't have to go to Russia to hear these questions asked, or a negative answer given! These questions are in the minds of many persons here in America; and the answers appeal to many who are not to be found either in the church school or in the student agnostic club.

## II

When we set about, therefore, to consider our aims and ideals in Religious Education, we had best take into account not merely the problem as it confronts us—who wish to get something taught that is not taught in the public schools, a curriculum of religious knowledge—but the problem

as it faces, or soon will face, the child himself. This is something intensely practical, and far from academic.

Religion is by no means performing its full function, if it insists upon viewing the child as an isolated unit, standing in no relation to the social whole of which he forms a part. Nor is religion likely to get far these days unless it casts off its own inheritance of pietism, and views its task socially. The great religions of mankind, and chiefly Judaism and Christianity, have been concerned, historically, with the life of groups, of communities. Judaism was the religion of a nation; and Christianity began with the ideal of the kingdom of God, which later evolved into the mediæval idea of the Catholic Church. The earlier Protestant groups, speaking historically, and referring chiefly to the English-speaking world, were inspired for the most part with a religion that required expression in the life of the community: trade and politics were as much its native heath as prayer meetings and theological debates. If you question this sweeping statement, read some of the newer works in social history—such as those of Weber, Tawney, and Troeltsch; or consult, as I have consulted recently, the civil codes governing the early American colonies; or read some of the recent studies of American Protestant religious history, and behold the extent to which community life and religion have been interwoven hitherto. And I venture to add that where the church is losing ground to-day—as it certainly is, in some areas—the change has come as a result of the widespread feeling that religion is a purely private concern, something you can take or leave, as you choose, a type of emotional or æsthetic refinement that has nothing to do with the common, everyday affairs of life, and need never interfere with a man's business or politics. Certainly this is just about the opposite of the "Catholic" conception of religion, or the Anglican; and it would not be difficult to prove it the opposite of the conception held by the great historic churches of the Reformation—excepting, of course, those Lutheran groups, and some others, that substituted a purely individual and pietistic kind of religion for the commonly-accepted and traditional type.

You must forgive me, if you think this a theological professor's pet hobby, and a digression from our main subject. On the contrary, I believe it is fundamental to our whole concern. We began with the question, Why teach religion? And the answer is, If you once get a clear idea of what religion is, there is nothing else to do—provided you believe in the religion! The great fault with our common life to-day is that it is falling

into disunity. There are not enough common loyalties, beliefs, and standards, to hold us together. As I see it, only religion—and in the Christian religion we certainly include Christian ethics—only a high ethical religion can draw us together and knit us into one united civilized people. Hence the urgency of Christian reunion, not as something to take place a century from now, but right away—within ten years if possible! Hence the urgency of a common program of education in religion, so that the coming generation may not be entirely robbed of its spiritual inheritance, and may find the strength and the inspiration to go forward to tasks we are leaving undone and to new ones that are sure to emerge!—For a long time, now, our motto might almost seem to have been, *Everything goes!* “Do what seemeth good in thine eyes”—provided you can “get away with it!” But there are signs of revulsion from this attitude of lenience and laxity: for we can see all too clearly where it is leading us. The moving pictures have become a menace. The “Armaments Racket” turns out to be run for private profit, not for patriotic ends. Any gangster can buy a gun, in this free country. Many of the mills appear to be run not to provide commodities, but to make a few rich at the expense of the public and of their laborers. Strike-agitators have no more regard for the common good than for their employer’s property. And so on—these are only illustrations; but they illustrate a steady progress in the direction of moral and social chaos—not toward a social solidarity rooted in mutual confidence and common service. And we are now suddenly becoming aware, here in America, of the dysgenic and disintegrative effects of our old ingrained attitude of complete liberty. It was all right, perhaps, on the frontier; but it wont do at all, in a settled society living in or near great cities, and as utterly interdependent as our population has become at the present time. If religion has lost its grip upon the situation, it would not be difficult to show that a large part of our present lack of social cohesion is a direct consequence of that weakened control. And if religion is once more to be geared into the actual life of men and women, I think it is fairly clear where we must begin. We must begin by teaching a religion that has the closest possible contacts with everyday life, and has a real, positive power to contribute through those contacts.

### III

Education in religion is a part—the most vital part—of the child’s

education as a whole. It belongs in the very center and quite at the heart of his education for citizenship, for industry, for the total life he is to live as a member of the community. With this in mind I propose to set down some ideals of education in religion that I think deserve our careful consideration.

1. The first thing is physical health. This is an ideal of education as old as Plato, and older. To be a normal member of society, and in order to live the richest possible life as an individual, the child must have "a sound mind in a sound body": *mens sana in corpore sano*. This perhaps requires no elaboration at the present day, when American schools as a whole are in the forefront of education for health. But I would emphasize in passing that this is quite as much a religious ideal as a secular. Pindar wrote odes to celebrate the prowess of athletes as a gift of the gods. And Saint Paul insisted that the Christian's body is "the temple of the Holy Ghost." How much of sound ethical outlook depends—really depends, it is not too much to say—upon a physical body and brain functioning normally, enjoying wholesome games, capable of withstanding strains, unexhausted by the terrific draughts upon nervous energy made necessary by the strenuous kind of life most human beings lead to-day!

2. The second ideal seems to me to be a clear recognition of the ethical virtues, and a purpose set upon realizing them in daily life and in the world at large. This sounds very abstruse and academic. But it need not be so. The material we choose, and the methods: stories, projects, discussions, and so on, should be selected with these as their clear aim and goal. I do not mean that all the virtues must be taught at once—some of them mean more as the child grows older. Nor that they must be taught didactically: for example, "To-day, dear children, we are going to study the virtue of patience." But the materials we use, and the tone of their presentation, should unquestionably achieve the effect of making virtue interesting, and desirable. Somehow, the child should be led to see that patience, liberality, gentleness, temperance, courage are real achievements. We need not be too obvious about it. On the other hand, we do not need a great amount of subtlety and indirection. It is not difficult to make it clear that these virtues are worthy of admiration and emulation. The child naturally responds at once, when the quality is clearly pointed out.

But I am afraid we get the cart ahead of the horse, sometimes. We try to cultivate the theological virtues before the cardinal! We appeal for

an insight into the meaning of sacrifice, self-denial, self-abnegation, before the child has learned justice, prudence, temperance, or fortitude! As a result we get the ethically unbalanced adult who knows and cares little about justice, but grows emotional over the virtue of humility or the sin of pride, the virtue of diligence or the sin of sloth, the virtue of liberality or the sin of covetousness. Let us try to put first things first, and sweep out of the church the artificial and mawkish sentimentalism that would sometimes substitute the virtues of the saints for the common decencies of life! They are not substitutes; they are the crown and summit of the natural virtues, built upon these lowly but indispensable foundations, and meaningless apart from them. The supernatural is no opposite of the natural, but is added to it, by the work of divine grace: *supra naturam, non contra naturam*, as the schoolmen said. I confess great sympathy for the revolt of certain youths I know who have been taught that they must "give up all for Jesus," but have never been told anything about the elements of justice in the world-scheme, and in the whole life of men as children of one Father. Or who have had Christianity presented to them as the straight-out negation of all the natural desires of human beings, rather than as a richer insight into life's real meaning, a harmony wherein every part has its proper place—and the natural has its part, though it is not the whole theme. Or who have had Christianity presented to them as something irrational, which one can only accept or reject, instead of the elevation and sublimation of reason to its highest possible level, in harmony with the steady onward advance, under the guidance of divine inspiration, into the mysterious, adventurous, entralling world unknown that lies all about us. Christianity is still, as it was in the first century, a "Way": the Way of Life. By living it you come to know it; but you do not live it by turning your back upon all that you have known to be good and worth effort in your life hitherto.

3. A third ideal is worship. Too much of our education in religion, too much of our education generally, has been doctrinaire and didactic, heretofore. The child has learned about God, but he hasn't come to know God, directly and at first hand. Such a second-hand religion is no help when one comes face to face with intellectual problems, or with the ethical, personal problems of one's own life. All he can say is, "So-and-so told me that somebody said God is wise, and loving; but I've never been able to see it." In such an hour the strain of crisis simply banishes all the favor-

able conditions that once surrounded the teaching. It was a bright and sunny hour; but the seed wasn't planted deep enough. In the burning heat of to-day, or the week of dry hot winds from the desert, the tender plant inevitably withers and dies.

Religion is essentially contact with the invisible, faith in God who is unseen but very near, trust in his sure response, confidence in the reality of his laws, personal committal to his will, expectation that he will meet us more than half way when we turn to him. How then can a person be religious at all unless he experiences something of this in his own life? If we are really trying to educate our children in religion, we will not be content to tell them about God, but will lead them into his presence, introduce them, so to speak, and let them come to know him for themselves.—This is a very practical matter. It is right to discuss prayer; but that should be only the preface to actual praying, actual worship, in the class, in the church-school service, in the church, and as a group. And the service should be in closest touch with reality, and ring true. The prayers, the hymns, the selections from scripture, should all mean something to the child, voice his needs and aspirations, satisfy his wants, speak directly to him and for him.

The life that pulses at the heart of the church is a spiritual life. It comes to its fullest and richest expression in the common worship. Normal religious experience is "worship-centered." Hence those teachers are wisest who likewise center the teaching of the church's doctrines, ways and customs, habits and standards, in the common worship. For the survival-value of such teaching, and such method, one has only to look at those churches which retain in the modern world the strongest proportion of the Catholic tradition in their doctrine and in their methods.

4. Another ideal is the appreciation of religious literature, art, and music, and the cultivation of true standards of taste.—At last we have come to the Bible! Yes, but to a different kind of Bible than our grandfathers read and marked: though it is certainly true they had their favorite passages and books, and reread what had found them in their very heart of hearts, and spoke to them in their need.

There is no reason, so far as I can see, for elaborate courses in biblical history or biography, until we come to the high-school age. Nor any particular reason why lesson after lesson should be taken from Old or New Testament. Christian history supplies characters equally interesting and

inspiring, even after the first century had ended; and I fear that most of Saint Paul is lost upon boys and girls before the very late 'teens.—I was talking with a clergyman from Iceland not long ago. He always substituted the national saga for the Old Testament, he told me: his children were not Jews, and knew nothing of a Hebrew background. That is all very well and as it should be, I believe, if proper standards of selection prevail. But certainly no child is going to share fully in his own rightful inheritance if he knows nothing of the Bible. And how can he understand European history, or literature, or art, or music, without knowing fairly well the double background of Græco-Roman civilization and the Hebrew-Jewish tradition of religion? The place for such study is, I believe, where it will find closest correlation with his other studies, in history and literature: that is, in high school. Ideally, such courses ought to be given in the high school itself, as part of the study of our heritage of civilization, for us the most vital part of world history and world literature. But that is not possible at present, thanks to the religious situation and the conflicting views of various religious groups. Hence the church has to supply this lack, as best it can. And that best, I believe, should include careful correlation with other courses in ancient life and thought. That is how the Bible gets its distinctive flavor, and brings out its true religious value—not in isolation, but in closest contact with other history and other literature. In such contact, the Bible shows us the record of a living faith, in close contact and often in conflict with a real world of actual men and women. So understood, and so only, it comes to have a message for us to-day. This is the way the Bible is to be understood as the present. And if we are to encourage our children to read the Bible for the sheer love of it, and to find in it what finds them, this is surely the way we ought to set about it.

5. Another ideal, and one to which perhaps the Bible will lead us, at least part way, is a religious interpretation of history, science, and human life generally. What is the meaning of this vast pageant of the past, reaching back into the dim beginnings of human history, and moving forward steadily through the centuries down to the present, and on beyond us into the unknown future? Why are we here? And what progress, if any, have we made thus far? Progress there certainly has been, in the arts, and in science, in man's knowledge about himself and his world. But what is the meaning of it all? The Hebrews had their answer: In the beginning

was God, who created the world, and chose certain individuals to receive his revelation, chose a race to be his servants. World-history was sacred history, as far as they were concerned. More or less, this was also true of other nations, other religions. It is only in recent times that men have felt themselves cut adrift from *a past with a purpose*, and that we hear such phrases as "man's homelessness in the universe," or man "the chance product of evolution." Unless we can regain, somehow, the old sense of the purpose of God—a purpose seen in the wide reaches of universal history—we are going to see religion backed into a corner and cut off from all real contact with the actual, moving, motivating thoughts of men. But it is not hard to see that purpose—not in terms of chosen races, but of the gradual unfolding of the whole higher life of man, "in many parts and after divers manners," the world over; or to see the revelation of God as something advancing step by step, parallel to and in fact prior to man's discovery of God and the evolution of his ideas about God and the meaning of life, as men "were able to receive it." No greater service can be rendered any child by any teacher than the awakening of this sense of a purpose in life, in natural evolution, in human history, and, as its culmination, in the religious development of mankind.

6. Out of this grows another ideal: the vision of world-peace, world-unity, world-fellowship. This lies in the future, and so is a vision still—an insight into what is going to be, when God's Reign is at last fully realized over the nations of the earth. Christianity set forth with this kingdom-ideal. The church's first prayer was, "Thy Kingdom come; thy will be done on earth as it is in heaven." We are nearer it to-day than ever before since the dawn of history. But near as it is, it may still be lost, and slip back into the fog of the unknown that lies ahead of us. To bring it somewhat nearer to realization is the highest task that confronts our generation, and still the noblest goal the church can set before itself. No education in religion that leaves out this ideal can be thought to be true to itself. And on the contrary, small as the individual contribution may appear, it is only as men everywhere begin to demand that wars shall cease, and that nations shall live and let live, and that understanding and mutual respect shall take the place of competition and discord—only so shall the ideal begin to be actual. And that demand must come, eventually, from multitudes of individuals who see this vision and cherish this hope.

7. Out of it all, as the final goal of a sound, genuine, rounded edu-

cation in religion, must emerge a conviction of the reality of the eternal values, and, as the bearer of those values, the immortality of the individual. I should not worry much if adolescents voice their doubts upon it. After all, this is an adult faith, though it should be taken for granted in all education of children. But let them see this, namely, that it is a conviction arising out of experience, not an inference from a set of proofs or a Q. E. D. at the end of an argument; that the concrete problem is not, "Is immortality true?" but rather, "Is it thinkable that the best thing in the universe, human character, should go for nothing, and that a noble man or woman who has given his or her utmost best in life should die and pass into nothingness?" It takes real living to arrive at real convictions. As Inge says, there is some question as to who have the *right* to believe in immortality. A life that has devoted itself for years to the pursuit of selfishness or lust or avarice or cruelty cannot be expected to look upon itself as destined for life everlasting. But a life lived in union with God and obedient to his purposes not only may, but in some sense must, believe in its own immortality, as sharing in some degree in the eternity of God himself, to whom, even here and now, it is inseparably attached. Not that eternal life is a reward for virtue: for virtue is its own reward. But the prize the obedient soul can honestly claim—and cannot well claim less—is, as Tennyson put it,

"The wages of *going on*, and *not to fail*."

I know there are religious men and women who care nothing about their own immortality: but that is only a projection of their attitude toward themselves in this life. For them, "death does not count": it is only an incident, and they face it as unconcernedly as they face a serious operation—confidently, and calmly, and without alarm. But what about the rest of us? Our problem is not that we may die and that be the end of us; our problem is that those dear to us may do so, or that those great souls who are the very lights in heaven above our cloudy skies should die and cease to be. Plato's chief problem was not that he might die and perish utterly; nor that he might not find arguments enough to prove the immortality of the soul; Plato's problem was the death of Socrates. How could such a man die utterly and pass into extinction, if there be justice at the heart of things? And his answer was, There is justice, and Socrates still lives. Saint Paul's conviction, though on a higher level of emotion, and phrased

in different terms, is not dissimilar: "Who shall separate us from the love of Christ? . . . I am persuaded that neither death, nor life, nor angels, nor principalities, nor things present, nor things to come, nor powers, nor height, nor depth, nor any other creature, shall be able to separate us from the love of God, which is in Christ Jesus our Lord."

That is what I mean by a conviction growing out of living experience. You cannot provide the experience for your pupils or your children; life does that. But you can guide it, a little; and you can help those emerging convictions to take shape, and grow firm, and get related to one another, and get thought-out in rational terms, and get set as the very underpinning and foundation of an honest, genuine, upright Christian life.

# The Clinical Training of Theological Students

H. FLANDERS DUNBAR, M.D.

**I**N September, 1934, the Council for the Clinical Training of Theological Students held its fifth annual conference as an incorporated body.

For five years previous to its incorporation it had existed as an experimental group, and its conferences had been informal discussions of those interested in an experiment. Because this experiment has resulted in an organization potentially national in scope, and well on its way toward becoming so in actuality, it may be of value to outline the main stages of its development.

In 1925 the only trace to be found of this new project in theological education was two theological students in a Massachusetts mental hospital, working twelve hours a day as attendants on the wards. Their presence there in itself represented no inconsiderable achievement. The Chaplain, to whose agitation the initiation of this movement is largely due, had already spent weary years among hospital superintendents before he found one with sufficient daring and vision to permit anything so startling as the advent of theological students into his domain.

At that time it was pointed out that the clergyman alone among specialists in human problems, is forced, in most instances, to go directly from his books to his practice in the community, like the medical student of about sixty years ago. In his study he meets for the first time problems about which he has read but in the handling of which he has not been trained. He may spend the best hours of his ministry discussing religious problems with a parishioner who is physiologically and psychologically unable to grasp what he is saying and who indeed may be harmed by it. On another occasion he may pass over as relatively unimportant an incipient problem which he could relieve but which, because of his oversight, goes on piling up to bring disaster not only for the parishioner, but also for the parish.

Theological students themselves, and men in the midst of the mistakes of the first ten years out, were among the first to recognize their need. The first two students at Worcester, in spite of the weary hours of orderly duty,

felt they had learned something they could never have learned in their seminaries, which, however, was of fundamental importance to them. In consequence, more students applied for training in the second year. To those under whose supervision this work started, the necessity became obvious of attempting to answer the question as to just what clinical training for theological students should mean. They entered then on the problem of experimental development of curriculum. The program they developed has been published in outline in the Council's pamphlet.<sup>1</sup> The work was established in 1929 in two other hospitals, the Rhode Island State Hospital, Howard, Rhode Island, and the Pittsburgh City Home and Hospitals, Mayview, Pennsylvania.

During this period, 1925-1930, physicians and clergymen throughout the country were coming to realize that clergymen do need clinical training, a fact which in 1925 was considered a radical and revolutionary idea. This realization came about not primarily through the Council, because the Council itself is a phenomenon of the times, but as a development coming simultaneously from the side of medicine and from the side of religion.

Looking at the medical side first, I want to recall a remark made by President Lowell. "It is hardly an exaggeration to summarize the history of 400 years by saying that the leading idea of a conquering nation in relation to the conquered was in 1600 to change their religion; in 1700 to change their laws; in 1800 to change their trade; and in 1900 to change their drainage."<sup>2</sup> Many physicians have commented on this passage saying, "This places modern medicine, especially in the aspects of hygiene and public health, in the forefront of our civilization." But most of us fail to realize what this means. The last centuries of specialization have helped us to forget that originally the powers of priest and physician were vested in one person, and that to-day, although separated, they are fundamentally related.

Those into whose hands we have placed the responsibility for our health to-day have come to a new realization of the part played by psychic factors in health and illness. This has resulted on the one hand in the opening up of a new field of scientific investigation, and on the other in practical applications in terms of prevention. In recognizing the primary

<sup>1</sup> H. Flanders Dunbar: *A New Opportunity in Theological Education*. A description of policy and program of the Council for the Clinical Training of Theological Students, Inc. (Revised and Approved for 1935.)

<sup>2</sup> Howard W. Haggard: *The Lame, The Halt, and The Blind*. The vital rôle of medicine in the history of civilization. New York, Harper & Brothers, 1932, pp. 4-5.

importance of prevention, our health officers have come to realize that their programs must include medical workers, and social workers, and leaders of industry, those who have control of public works and housing conditions, parents, and teachers, and also, and even primarily, clergymen. The term health is coming now to "include sanity of beliefs as well as soundness of body,"<sup>8</sup> health of either soul or body involves the health of both.

We all realize to-day that the clergyman needs practical training in handling human problems and this, following the medical analogy, the Council has termed clinical training. It would be more appropriate to call it pastoral training, but unfortunately in pastoral training as understood in the seminaries, even including courses in pastoral theology, the all-important factor implied by physicians in the term clinical is omitted. In other words, students are told by experienced pastors what to do in such and such a case, but they rarely or never see the case in question. The more progressive among our seminaries give courses in abnormal psychology and psychiatry but again without adequate clinical material; that is, without giving the student opportunity for contact with the human being whose problems he is discussing. For this reason it remains an open question whether such courses do more harm or good. To remedy this defect, field-work courses are being given increasingly serious attention, but they have remained fragmentary (that is, a matter of so many hours a week rather than of continuous residence), and fragmentary experience of human beings leaves the clergyman in a situation analogous to that of the doctor who treats patients in terms of a "knee named Jones," and a "heart named Rutherford." The heart or the knee may be interesting, but physicians realize to-day that neither one has much meaning and that neither one can be treated effectively without an understanding of the personality to whom the heart or the knee belongs. Similarly the youth as he appears in the boys' club or the lady as she receives the minister is only a fragment of the total lady or the total boy. The clergyman will be able to give wise advice to the lady who pours forth her troubles while entertaining him for tea only if he has some conception of the total lady—during the other twenty-three hours of the day and the thirty, forty, or fifty odd years of her life. This type of understanding of people is obtained only by living with them through long years of pastoral experience and even then less satisfactorily than by living with them in a controlled setting working together with other specialists in

<sup>8</sup> Charles Macie Campbell: *Delusion and Belief*, Cambridge, Mass. Harvard, 1927, p. 5.

human problems; for example, the general physician, the psychiatrist, the laboratory man, and the social worker.

The first five years of the Council's existence may be summarized as a period of opening of doors, while the ideas just noted were spreading in professional and lay groups. The second five years of its development, just terminating, brought a new problem; the doors were opened but standards were needed. As happens inevitably in any new movement, or with any new idea, the pendulum swung to the opposite extreme. With the realization of the theological student's need for clinical training came an enthusiasm throughout the seminaries of our country for training in mental hygiene, psychology, and psychiatry. The clergyman, especially the young clergyman and seminary student, felt himself lacking. It was felt that other specialists in human problems were possessed of superior techniques.

This enthusiasm led to conflicts with elders in the church and with the medical profession. Theological students began to be found in child guidance clinics, hospitals, and institutions for social welfare throughout the country, getting such training as they could, very often without the approval of their seminaries and very generally without adequate supervision. Only too often, these students, after a few months' training, went out into the community to set up psychiatric clinics (with no medical affiliation) in churches, and to apply what they had picked up of psychiatric techniques in their pastoral work. Such notices as the following are attracting increasing numbers of people: "Now at last you can consult a psychoanalyst free of charge. Come to our church clinic!" This situation played into the hands of charlatanism and is still a public menace. . . .<sup>4</sup> More than this it tends to rob our communities of their pastors.

In his parish calling, the pastor has opportunity to spot the first signs of incipient disease, physical or mental, before the parishioner has even realized the need of coming to him. This is a thing that only the clergyman can do. The tendency on the part of the clergyman to use the new training in personality problems which is now open to him as an excuse for devoting more and more of his time to personal counseling with a therapeutic emphasis is distinctly unfortunate, because that is the sort of thing that the general physician and psychiatrist can do and are especially trained to do. Furthermore, the clergyman in many instances is wasting time

<sup>4</sup>H. Flanders Dunbar: *A New Opportunity in Theological Education*. A description of the policy and program of the Council for the Clinical Training of Theological Students. (Revised and approved for 1935.) P. 9.

which might be of untold value in terms of prevention were he to spend it instead in the homes of his parishioners. He should not forget that he is the one officer of health who is welcome in these homes before illness has developed.

In other words, the clergyman has a responsibility for the detection of illness in its early beginnings before the parishioner himself is aware of it, and for the handling of it by wise advice or by early utilization of the resources of his community, including general physician, psychiatrist, social agencies, and so on. There is a more specialized help he can give in hospitals; but it is important that, with the clergyman's growing interest in the more serious forms of mental and physical illness, his attention be not too much distracted either from his responsibility in prevention or from his own unique contribution as a pastor.

It is little wonder that students should have clamored for clinical training, feeling themselves maimed by its lack in the seminaries. It is unfortunate that to-day many of them get it under circumstances where standards are inadequate from either a medical or a religious point of view.

This is particularly important also from the point of view of the co-operation of clergyman and physician. To-day the medical profession has established standards for its youngest specialists, psychiatrists. It has come to realize that taking cover beneath the label of psychiatrist are a great many dabblers in human problems most of whom do more harm than good because they have little or no training. Equally important is the realization that the average physician, be he specialist in a big city or general practitioner in a rural community, must have specialized training in emotional problems in addition to his general medicine and surgery.

An ideal of the general physician to-day is a man as well trained in psychiatry as he is in medicine and surgery. In the big cities we will always have specialization, psychiatrists and surgeons and internists, and even subdivisions among them. In the rural communities we must have men equally trained in the psychic and somatic aspects of illness, and able to pick out the curable from the incurable and to devote time to the former in cases where facilities are inadequate.

With this advance in medical circles there has come from the side of mental hygiene and preventive medicine an attempt to warn the public against charlatans and the inadequately trained, particularly among those who aim to treat mental and emotional ills, be they medical men, clergymen,

or laymen. For this reason we are entering a third phase of the relationship of clergyman to physician. We had first separation and suspicion on both sides, then friendliness of an erratic sort, and now a definite move toward real co-operation, involving standards of co-operation, and a warning to the public against those who do not meet these standards.

In other words, theological students who have picked up training as best they could, too often with the approval of the very men within the medical profession who are being taken to task for their own inadequacies, will be increasingly subjected to a type of criticism which is dangerous from the point of view of their leadership in their parishes. On the other hand, those who have had training which comes up to certain standards are welcomed as perhaps never before by the physicians of the community.

It is to protect clergymen in this respect that the Council for the Clinical Training of Theological Students, having set out to open doors for clinical training, is now becoming an organization in the religious field, similar to the American Medical Association in medicine, to set standards of training. This does not mean intervention in any given seminary, but it does mean approving those institutions where theological students can be given, in terms of our present knowledge, adequate clinical training or internships, just as the American Medical Association approves hospitals for internships for medical students throughout the country.

Joint supervision by trained clergyman and physician of theological students in clinical training was found to be a fundamental necessity if the student is to be given this experience and at the same time safeguarded against being misled by it. There is nothing more disastrous than courses of training which give the student too little help in the assimilation of his new experience in terms of his tradition and the unique responsibility of his calling.

It is very largely for this reason that the Council has preferred to grow slowly. Its present geographic distribution is from Boston to Baltimore, and west to Chicago, including New Jersey, Syracuse, Pittsburgh, etc. The Council has received requests from hospitals to become training centers and to be provided with theological supervisors. The Council has postponed opening training centers in these hospitals either because the institution has lacked an adequate teaching representative of its own or because the Council has not been able to send a pastor adequately trained to supervise students.

In summarizing briefly the Council's growth during the second half

decade, two points of gain should be emphasized: a closer relationship to the medical profession; and a closer relationship to the seminaries. At the outset it was students who clamored for this training rather than their teachers on seminary faculties. It was only four years ago that a student from a seminary which had remained until then unaware of the Council's existence, came to a Council representative with the request that a group of students at his seminary be told about this opportunity for training. The Council representative assented willingly, asking who among the seminary officials were particularly interested. The student said: "Oh, don't tell the faculty about it. They wouldn't understand." Within the last two years a faculty representative has been appointed in most of the thirty seminaries sending students, to help the Council in the choice of students and in the relating of its work to the seminary curriculum. Although the depression has not spared the seminaries, their financial contributions to the Council in terms of scholarships given to students for this training have tripled within the past year. Support from the side of medicine has continued to increase steadily although for reasons already given new training centers are being opened slowly.

Entering now a second decade of life with these two important steps behind it, the Council is turning its attention to several new and important problems. They are, first: the study of religious teaching in the light of mental hygiene; and second: the development of those techniques which are especially the clergyman's own. As is apparent, both have to do with the clergyman's assimilation of his new experience.

Thus far emphasis has been laid on the clergyman's task in ministering to those who are ill, because this is the aspect of his ministry with which the clergyman to-day is likely to be most intrigued, and in connection with which he is stressing his need of specialized technique. As a matter of fact the pastor who wishes the best for his people should shift a great part of this burden to other shoulders than his own—in our large cities to clinics and social agencies, in rural communities to the family doctor. If he finds himself surrounded by admiring and devoted parishioners he thinks he is succeeding. He seldom stops to look into their faces and ask himself what these particular people represent in the community, and in terms of health. Should he do so, he would find very often that his most devoted admirers constitute a little army of neurotic people whom he is helping forward on their way to the mental and general hospital. Rare is the pastor with suffi-

cient objectivity and holy indifference to enable him to avoid sticky transfer-  
ence situations which indicate immaturity in his personality. All this too  
often blinds him to the problem of incipient illness and to his responsibility  
for those who are well.

Still more important, the clergyman in his pastoral work is only too  
likely to forget that his responsibility for the health of his parishioners  
begins long before they begin to come to him in distress, in his teaching and  
his utterances from the pulpit. There is a great need for a rethinking of  
religious concepts and techniques in terms of what we know of emotional  
life and development. It is of the essence of religion to present a way of  
life and principles of individual and group conduct, yet the clergyman is  
too often unaware of the extent to which through this function he molds  
lives, contributing to health or disease of both the individual and the social  
order.<sup>5</sup> An important element in the Council's relationships to the semi-  
naries is its stimulation of seminary courses for the specific purpose of assisting  
students in assimilating their clinical experience in terms of their tradition.  
At least one seminary announces such a course.

This whole question is one to which only passing reference can be made  
because an adequate handling of it demands careful study by men trained  
in religion, but trained also in what we may call the clinical approach to  
people. There is too great a tendency to feel that matters such as these can  
be thought out in quiet hours. But the clergyman who remains in his study,  
even seeing people there, will have a very inadequate concept of the part  
which religion plays in their lives and of the way in which he himself is  
molding them. All this can be said equally concerning the study and  
development of the specifically religious techniques such as prayer, medita-  
tion and services of worship. On these problems older students are work-  
ing, with the help of the Council's advisors in hospitals and seminaries.

It is interesting to recall that Charles Steinmetz, questioned as to  
the next greatest invention, pointed out the need for a laboratory for the  
study of religion. There is a sense in which the Council for the Clinical  
Training of Theological Students can be considered such a laboratory. The  
student working side by side with the physician, social worker, psychologist,  
and laboratory man finds himself with actual laboratory facilities for the  
working out of his problems.

<sup>5</sup> Cf. H. Flanders Dunbar: *Mental Hygiene and Religious Teaching*. MENTAL HYGIENE, July, 1935,  
for a fuller discussion of this topic.

## Mysticism

JOHN W. HOFFMAN

**A** PLEA for mysticism may be deemed somewhat futile at a time when social problems, historical criticism and the scientific method are so fully engaging the attention of thoughtful men. Positivism, with its insistence that valid knowledge must be limited to the empirical sciences, various cults of humanistic character and a resulting prevalent naturalism assure us that the resources of the disciplined intellect are sufficient for all the needs of life. In short, reconstructive philosophies and social practices, in which there is a conspicuous absence of religious ideals and values, seem to command the homage of the present generation.

Furthermore we are warned that the dreamy, meditative, monastic conception of religion is no longer tenable. Our age requires that the great verities of religious experience be stated in terms of exact thought and closely related to the practical needs of society. Reality must be interpreted and combined into "reasoned forms of knowledge." We are advised that mystical religion is such a vague, intangible, unanalyzable state of consciousness that description is practically impossible; that thoughtful men should not commit themselves to a form of the religious consciousness so incapable of exact definition and so remote from life. Notwithstanding these criticisms of historic and present-day mysticism, we believe that its culture was never more greatly needed. It is evident that the scientific method is in no sense final and inclusive of a whole experience, and that the soul must have a more adequate recognition. The critical and analytical faculties of mind must be supplemented by the artistic and constructive. We need "a spiritual epoch," as Maeterlinck declares, in which, as Canon Raven (*Jesus and the Gospel of Love*) points out, religion will be conceived as the "achievement of the whole personality operative at its highest level of integration." The one thing absolutely indispensable in such an epoch is an abiding consciousness of God.

However difficult of description, no one need misunderstand mystical religion as did Vaughan, when he declared "it was that form of error which mistakes for a Divine manifestation the operation of merely human faculties." Professor Rufus Jones, combining the best of many concep-

tions, *Studies in Mystical Religion*, employs the word as expressing that "type of religion which puts the emphasis on immediate awareness of relation with God, on direct and intimate consciousness of the Divine Presence." Récéjac has an accurate definition: "Mysticism is the tendency to approach the Absolute morally, and by means of symbols." Whatever may be our understanding of the word and the reality symbolized by it, at the heart of all mystical states there is a realization of the presence of God, resulting in new insights, new power, new meaning to prayer, and new enlightenment. It is both a reflective process and a moral process.

The three great ultimates of human thought—God—The World—Man, are "experienced separately," as Hocking insists, "never as a confused unity." God must not only, therefore, be regarded as an object of thought but also as a "subject of experience." The "precipitate of ideas into action" and the inevitable movement of ideas into ideals may be valid in natural science and laboratory research but certainly not in ethics, religion, and the social sciences. While no well-informed man will undervalue the resourcefulness of the disciplined intellect, life is eternally and tragically revealing how inadequate it is to resist the onslaughts of hate and greed, and to develop moral and social ideals competent to transform human life. Ideas must be energized by a personal experience of God.

In our approach to God, in order thus to know him, we believe the historic mystical path is still valid and necessary. Whatever of vagaries we find in the ancient mystics, and there are many, the three classic stages by which we realize God are essential. Of course we need not undervalue historical and objective truths, neither need we accept wholly the metaphysics and the psychology of Plato, Aristotle, and Plotinus. Nevertheless, we cannot dispense with the mystical mode of coming into a vivid experience of God. The purgative process, which is the first step in the ascent, is fundamental. "The pure in heart see God." We need moral cleansing as well as intellectual clearness. The terrible ascetic practices of the ancient and medieval mystics grew out of their profound consciousness of sin and their resolute determination to be purged from it. Not all believed that the body was evil. Tauler taught, as did others, that only evil passions were to be crucified, not the body, and that these evil dispositions had their roots in an attitude of the will. That many abnormalities, such as trances, visions, ecstasies, and in some instances immorality, occurred, is well known. But these were due either to a defective meta-

physics or a false psychology. No more shallow criticism is hurled at the mystic than that his experience is a product of temperament, or suggestibility, or social tradition. Hocking, who has made a most extensive study of mysticism, shows that all temperaments were found among the mystics, and their unusual suggestibility, as urged by Coe, is a gratuitous assumption. The mystic desired God and union with him, above all else. This ambition mastered all others, not only as the highest consummation of the logical process, but also as the most permanent satisfaction for the soul.

The mystic always emphasized that our approach to the Infinite must, in the final stage, be moral and personal rather than philosophical. "Its logic," as Récéjac declares, "consists in trusting in the moral purity of the will or in the rationality of the Desire." In the moral processes of mind God comes into vital relations with the soul, rather than in the preliminary reflective ones. It is in his insistence on this moral realization of God that the mystic is invaluable in this scientific and naturalistic age.

The next stage in approach to God was that of illumination, in which the struggle is wholly transferred within the soul and all the capacities of mind are now turned full on God as the supreme object of thought. The third stage is the unitive or the state of perfect contemplation in which the soul has found its highest good—union with God, a consummate realization of the reality and blessedness of the Divine presence.

In the mystic's attempt at a unification of consciousness and of life, it is evident that his efforts thus to realize the Eternal will take place under the forms of thought peculiar to his age. The philosophy and psychology of the period in which he lives will influence him, and determine the technique but not the substance of his experience. When Augustine and Athanasius committed themselves to the doctrine that "God became man that we might become God," the way was prepared not only for deification but also for transubstantiation. Or when Plotinus followed Aristotle's conception of the Absolute, as being devoid of qualities and with no occupation save that of pure contemplation, we have an attempt to reach God by the negative path which continued until the close of the fourteenth century, when the Brethren of the Common Life wisely rejected this method. The difficulty of perceiving God apart from the intellectual currents of an age is forcefully illustrated by the doctrine of emanation. Such vagrant forms of mysticism as ecstasies, trances, visions were largely due, after the twelfth century, to the influence of the neo-Platonic writings of

pseudo-Dionysius. Men returned to the sane mysticism of John, Paul, Jesus, and the Hebrew prophets, only after they had *freed themselves* from the heavy load of scholasticism and errant forms of idealizing philosophy.

Man is ever in search of an authority that will give directness and convincingness to his life and thought. He will discover what Gerson, Eckhart, and Suso learned, that the finest philosophic and literary equipment are not sufficient for the solution of this problem of conduct. The soul must know intimately, and be certain of, the great Reality of the world. This becomes all the more urgent when one remembers that religion always tends to fixed forms in habit, custom, and ecclesiasticism, and observes the tendencies of modern science toward the "barrenness of the abstract and the too exclusive factuality of the concrete," as a result of which, as Lewis Mumford so ably insists in *Technics and Civilization*, "One side of personality was paralyzed: collectively one side of experience was ignored," and furthermore one notes the determined efforts of many psychologists to compress all vital data within the formula of mechanistic causation. Our technology, our tools and trade, the effort to extend the concepts of natural science and its technique over the whole of life, as well as the contention that objective knowledge is alone valid for scientific thought, and our external emphasis have reduced the resources of subjective life to a pitiful impotence and led many to regard it as unreal.

As a corrective for these defective views, we need the mystic with his insistence on moral inspiration and personal religious experience. The Fathers, with their fine adherence to objective and historical facts, gave us a great system of church life. With its formulas of truth and its mighty machinery, it has wrought much good. But it has also done some harm. Again and again it has sought to fetter the free spirit of inquiry and of conscious communion with God. Parrot-like, it repeated the solemn truths of Divinity, yet knew not God. Then it was that Montanism, the Waldensians, the Franciscans, the Friends of God, the Beghards, the Wesleys, rose and demanded that the priest should not absorb and destroy the prophet. History thus shows that a religion of inward experience is always the vital need of the church and of civilization.

Let us now analyze somewhat in detail the mystical approach to God. Récéjac explains that the mystic action is twofold: "The imagination is put in motion to produce symbols, and afterwards Reason proceeds to exercise the intuition proper to it." Two great words in the vocabulary of

the mystics greet us in this statement of Récéjac—"reason" and "imagination." The imagination must be stimulated into activity, the reason must sharply scrutinize the products of the imaginative intellect. In the earlier mystics reason was divided into a lower and a higher. The lower faculty was called thought, because it dealt with the differentiated and related, the data of sense experience, while the higher reason deals with contemplation. This distinction made by Aristotle holds the field practically unchallenged until Tauler protests against its consequence, which was the loss of individuality. It led Augustine to declare: "God is best adored in silence; best known by nescience; best described by negatives."

The value of this Aristotelian view is that it affirms something in the personality of man that responds to God. Plato and the Stoicks held firmly that we have an eye for absolute beauty and an ear for absolute truth. But the mischief of such a conception is that it assumes that man has a special organ or faculty by which he apprehends God, instead of affirming a unity of *the whole personality*. One can readily appreciate the dangers arising if this unity of approach should get out of balance. Action must be rational, thought must be clear, affection must be intelligent, else we are bound to run into fanaticism and "formless speculation." The modern mystic however is under no compulsion to accept the metaphysics and the epistemological method of Plato, Aristotle, or Plotinus—we have more reasonable views of Reality and personality. Modern ideas of personality will free us from the aberrations of the negative, ecstatic, and historic mysticism prevalent previous to the Reformation.

The mystic's use of his imagination—the symbol producing activity of the mind—is very important. It is peculiar to all this class of literature. In the great prophets, Isaiah, Jeremiah, Ezekiel, we find some of the noblest ideas clothed in the garb of symbols. In the teaching of Jesus, of John, and of Paul, this rich and precious form of truth illuminates many a page. The fact of symbolic presentation of reality neither lessens its value nor destroys its accuracy, as witness the fourteenth and the fifteenth chapters of John. Fanaticism arises when the symbol is made an object instead of recognizing, as does Professor Ormond (*Foundations of Knowledge*), that it "does not define content directly, but only by way of suggestion and analogy." The prophet from the mountain height grips the conscience and commands the will, not because he comes with an articulated system of religious philosophy, but because he has felt the injustice of life

and has seen God vividly and intensely, and conveys his message to us in the graphic and rugged language of the heart and of the imagination.

The phrase "immediate apprehension of God," so prevalent in mystical criticism, has done vast damage. It seems to imply that the mystic operates in a mental vacuum ignoring logic, history, sentiments. This is never the case. Mystical experience, in the approach to God, is the final movement of personality based on processes moral, logical, cognitive, and personal. The technique of all mystics is practically the same, whether æsthetic, natural, Oriental, or Christian; the differences in the effect on character are due to the materials employed in stimulating the creative imagination and the moral processes, as well as the kind of historic facts regarded as valid for the appraisal of the products of the imaginative intellect.

Neither rationalism nor sense-experience discovers a God above and beyond us and neither gives us an ontological message of reconstructive value? The majority of the great mystics began their search for truth as students of the physical sciences, as mathematicians, or as scholastics. They discovered that neither empiricism nor rationalism could ever reach such depths of being as to bring peace to the conscience and moral vigor to the will. While both may act as guides into the Holy of Holies, both must yield to a greater adventure of the soul. No man can rest content either with empiricism or dogmatism; he will move either to skepticism or to mysticism. It is clearly impossible to resolve all knowledge and experience into that which comes through sensation and reflection, for this leaves that tantalizing margin of universality undiscovered, and those irreducible principles of mind—cause and substance—as Hocking contends, unaccounted for. But, if self-consciousness, with its irreducible principles, is included in our world view, we have at once not only a basis for Idealism, but also for mystical religion. The universe becomes then a perpetual self-manifestation of God. It is unfortunate that the Barthians, with their fine insistence on the transcendence of God, carry it to such an extreme as almost to deny the active experience of the Christian and reduce him to a mere passive being. The modern mystic must therefore be, as Krause maintains, a "panentheist." He scorns neither sensationalism nor dogmatism, simply finds them inadequate for the whole adventure of mind and trusts "the moral consciousness enriched with symbolic representations" as the final activity of personality.

Our problem is to supply the imaginative intellect with materials for

activity. The search for these materials, previous to the Reformation, divided the mystics into two quite distinct schools—one declaring that we must retire within ourselves and find all data there; the other saying with Duns Scotus, who pleads for the outward and objective: "There are as many unveilings of God as there are saintly souls." With this ninth-century mystic, the universe was a mirror of God. Somehow the earlier mystics before the time of Luther failed to look at the various aspects of life with both eyes. God either revealed himself *in* the soul or *in* nature. Then, as now, a synthesis of the objective and subjective method seems to be exceedingly difficult. Let us be done with Plotinus and Dionysius, the Areopagite, and discover that God is everywhere, in the soul, in nature, in history; that the cosmic process and ethical purpose are fundamentally harmonious; and that reason, feeling, and will, science and religion are a unity in the apprehension of Reality each of which may be distinguished in their operation but never separated without injury to truth; and that these modes of discovery, revelation, and ways of regarding Reality supplement each other. Then the imaginative intellect will find its material, not only in meditation and contemplation, but in scientific observation, in the historic process, and in moral activity.

The final element of our problem still remains. "The imagination" must be "started into activity to produce symbols" ere we can enter within the sanctuary and have a real experience of God. The dynamic for this highest effort of the soul will be found in the feelings. "The source of mysticism in experience," asserts Professor Ormond (*Foundations of Knowledge*), "is to be found in the element of feeling which is never absolutely blind, but involves even in its lowest forms a germ of cognition." In analyzing the concrete psychoses, of which our consciousness is composed, Professor Ormond holds that they include "moments of thought, feeling and will and that the tendency of consciousness in its movement as a whole is to pass from a stage of lower immediacy called sensation, through the mediating processes of reflection, to a stage of higher immediacy that is characteristically emotional." Dantzig, in his *Number, the Language of Science*, urges a much larger recognition of intuition as well as of reason, feeling, and will in the apprehension of Reality. Here we have a firm psychological basis, not only for the active imagination, but the sanest of mysticism and the source of moral passion and enthusiasm. Professor Pratt (*Religious Consciousness*) describes this feel-

ing content of mind as the highest form of religion. It is here we find the great spiritual forces of life. To rest with sensation, to stop with the mediating processes of reflective thought, as does the rationalist, is to fail utterly of the last and highest movement of mind. It is because of this higher rationality of emotion that Ruskin could write: "There is reciprocal action between the intensity of moral feeling and the power of imagination." The great poets illustrate and confirm this. It has been said with much truth that "insight is proportioned to the strength of emotion." McDougall insists that the emotions are not an automatic reflex, but are the fountain head of human behavior finally dependent, not on sense data so much as the thoughtful pursuit of a goal and adjustment to environment. In the vividness and intensity of truth as we find it in the Scriptures, prophet and apostle exhibit the emotional process to a marked degree—they see clearly and speak with commanding certainty. While recognizing the perfect legitimacy of the rationalizing function of mind and the necessity for metaphysical elements in religion, neither is sufficient to generate moral passion and supply us with dynamic motives.

There is always danger that mystical religion may degenerate into sickly emotionalism; that ardor and enthusiasm shall lack the guidance of clear thinking and rigid logic, and that the objective will be ignored and a confused subjectivism result. It is easy to be swept along by the strongest impulse and mistake a keen desire for a manifestation of God. The experiences of the mystic must be subjected to the critical judgment of the whole mind—cognitive, affective, and conative—the moral ideals of the church, and the facts of history. They must also, as the Spanish mystic Saint John of the Cross writes, result in love to God, reverence, humility, and practical activity. So wrote Professor Ladd: "The religious development of mankind is dependent upon the harmonious activity of imagination and intellect in providing an Object which shall both accord with scientific development and shall also keep pace with the improvement of the ethical and æsthetical feelings and with the growing practical and social needs of the race." In short, the intellectual, emotional, and moral processes must be harmonious, supplemental, and well balanced. Jesus is the true mystic. In him we find that rationality, voluntary activity, and emotion are in perfect union. He gives to human life a picture of the Father, in which all the elements of personality blend and co-operate. It is because Jesus is so rational, so energetic, so practical, so deeply and truly emotional that the mystic can-

*not* ignore him. The feeling process in the saint must, therefore, always rest on a clear and definite rational content of historical facts and truths—if not, we have trances, visions and other violent distortions of religion.

We have rather roughly and fragmentarily traced the mystical path in its movement to a realizing sense of the Infinite. Our aim has been to show that such a lively consciousness of God, as an indwelling Person, furnishes human life with an authority and a moral passion that rest neither on social tradition nor theological dogma as its final source, but upon the personal experience of the reality and blessedness of God. Such experience will establish a transcendental and creative basis for moral obligation and supply man with the supreme incentive to practical effort. The mystical consciousness cannot be dreamy, passive, and aloof from the bitter struggle for bread. The Hebrew prophets, Mohammed, Buddha, Cromwell and John Wesley, Martin Luther and Lord Shaftesbury were practical mystics. So also were Eckhart, Tauler, Suso, Ruysbroek, Gerard Groote, Merswin, and the many sects, such as the Waldensians. To characterize these devout men as impractical, or to ascribe their noble efforts at reform and their consecrated service of humanity to temperament or environment, rather than to their piety, is to reveal a bias which hopelessly unfits one to form a fair estimate of these ancient saints. Eckhart and Tauler were the very opposite in temperament. Eckhart was cold, haughty, and austere, Tauler warm-hearted and ardent. These impassioned men saved the spirituality of religion in an age when the church had become a mighty ecclesiastical machine more concerned with dogma, dollars, and power than with the cure of sick and enfeebled humanity.

Practical mysticism, which is to give this transcendental and creative basis for the conduct of life, declares Professor Royce, "is the ordering of the life of an individual on the basis of the sensation of some form of immediate communion with God." "The mystic," continues Doctor Royce, "is a thorough-going empiricist." We are to understand Royce as using the word empiricist in a popular rather than a strictly philosophic sense. Empiricism would give us egotism, it would give us "what is," never "what ought to be." The strictly empirical philosophy, with its obvious sensational basis, cannot supply us with infinite and ideal motives for conduct. The moral "must," with its imperatives, arises from within the soul, from one's deepest response to the realization of God, for it is in this reaction of personality to God in which the "innermost essence of being manifests

itself." In saying this, we do not determine the content of obligation nor its forms, only its origin and its basis. The forms our practical energies will assume depend upon our philosophy, our idea of God, and our understanding of the needs of the age. If God is absolutely devoid of qualities, as Aristotle conceived him, then pure contemplation is the chief end of moral activity. But if he is the Father, as Christ conceived him, with tremendous human interests in *this* life and dynamic with personal qualities, then service and sacrifice are inevitable. We cannot accept the statement of John Smith, a Cambridge Platonist, when he says "such as men themselves are, such will God appear to them to be." It is as devoid of foundational data as the theory that the idea of God is the father projection of the human mind, or simply the complement of human need. The evidence is too convincing, as will be seen in an analysis of human progress, that men seek to become what they discover God to be through the processes of thought and moral experience. It is our metaphysics and our psychology, not our character, that lead us to form a God *without personal qualities*. The form and the ends of conduct will therefore be determined by the idea of God we accept as final. If God is the world, not to be distinguished from it; if he comes to self-consciousness only in individuals; if "God is all" and there is no subject-object relation in him, then logically, morality will take a very different direction from that, if we conceive him in terms of Jesus Christ. This sort of pantheism with its loss of individuality and its destruction of personal immortality is seen in its most shocking forms in the Ranters and Seekers of the English Commonwealth. The sacraments were scorned, official teaching was scouted, and the Scriptures were "carnal."

In these and other types of faulty morality, the cause lies not in the movement of the mystical consciousness so much as in the fact that a philosophic teacher had first formed their metaphysics. If God and the individual may be merged into each other so completely as to lose all identity, then nothing is sin unless one thinks it to be sin, and in that case all moral distinctions must disappear. Lift the mystical life out of its age-long bondage to Plotinian philosophy and free it from an Abstract Unity and we have a scheme of morality of noblest ideals.

One of the most serious criticisms of the mystic is that he fails to deal properly with sin. In his desire for unity and contact with the Absolute, he is accused of deliberately conceiving of religion as an escape, and shutting his eyes to the brutal aspects of life and nature. Admittedly it is difficult

to reconcile the presence of evil with the underlying reality of the universe, which we believe to be absolutely good. Efforts for the regeneration of men will be determined by one's conception of moral evil. In the mystic thought of sin we must remember that there are two quite distinct elements —the speculative and the practical. The mystic, as a philosopher, seeks to harmonize the God of religious experience with the Absolute of philosophy. The only reality, according to the philosopher, in the final analysis of life, is the Good, all else is non-real. Hence in Plotinus, Dionysius, the Areopagite, Augustine, Scotus Erigena and others: "Evil is the negation of Being." It is simply "privation of being." Emerson, who was greatly influenced by Plotinus, is the American voice of this mistaken view. Manifestly this is in no sense an adequate idea of sin. We cannot regard "evil as good in the making." It is flatly contrary to the Hebrew prophets and to Jesus, who taught most emphatically that it is something that ought not to be, and need not be. When, however, the mystic forgets his metaphysics, he defines sin as self-will or selfishness. Eckhart finds the root of sin in the attitude of the will, not in the flesh. "There is nothing evil," he declares, "but an evil will." In harmony with this is the positive statement of Ruysbroek, "You are as holy as you desire to be." Sin is self-seeking, self-aggrandizement, abnormal self-consciousness. Such a view is thoroughly Christian. Goodness, holiness, righteousness, with Christ and his apostles, are always possible, and actual when men ground their will in the larger will of God, when private aims yield to the purposes and ideals of Christ.

Modern life does not relish the practical, mystical Hebrew and Christian idea of sin. It would much rather regard it as "a relic of our brute inheritance," or "a mark of weakness, due to our finiteness," or as our "awkward attempts to rise in the scale of being," or as a "faulty reaction to life," or as "an inferiority complex." Sin is more endurable when viewed as a defect or mistake rather than a perversity, disloyalty to God, and a moral crime against the highest social good of humanity. With such views of sin so general, self-assertion, self-realization and naturalism are continually dinned in our ears and we forget self-abnegation and the spiritual character of Reality. Without undervaluing the natural beauty and normal good of this world, we need something of the spirit of the writer of the *Theologia Germanica*: "I would fain be to the eternal Goodness what his own hand is to a man." It is this absolute submission to God that involves the cross, self-denial and self-sacrifice.

As one reviews mystical experiences and movement in their historical entirety, he is deeply impressed with their service to humanity, and their certainty of God. To think of these saints of God as hiding themselves from the throbbing concrete realities of life is to forget that they were, in almost every instance, men and women of action as well as of thought and meditation. They saved inward religion time and again. The Quietists, Madame Guyon and Fenelon, contributed much to the uplift of France and were a splendid corrective for the rigid externalism of Bossuet. Molinos and others like him poured their consecrated energy into human life and sought earnestly to win men to right living. Gerson, Merswin, Eckhart, Tauler, and the Cambridge Platonists, were men who gave themselves unstintedly to the people. The poor had the gospel preached to them. While the church was bartering in the sanctuary and employing coercive measures to fetter mind and soul, these men who believed in conscious communion with God were founding hospitals, caring for the sick, distributing alms in many practical forms, and comforting the dying. They were men of great prayer. Their manuals of devotion still enrich thought and stimulate the soul. They gave moral dignity to all living as does Tauler, when he exhorts:

"One man can spin, another can make shoes, and all these are gifts of the Holy Ghost. I tell you, if I were not a priest, I should esteem it a great gift that I was able to make shoes, and I would try to make them so well as to be a pattern to all."

Here is practical life shot through and through with divinity. Passionately devoted to the Scriptures, to science, to philosophy and continually protesting against the priest absorbing the prophet, they have a commanding message for our generation. Their defects were due to their listening more ardently to Plato than to Christ and the Hebrew prophets and Paul. Yet these earnest thinkers never lost sight of the great aim that "the highest achievement of man is the inner consciousness of God." It is illogical to hold with Ritschl that mysticism is of Catholic origin and has no place in Protestantism, or with Hermann that mysticism institutes a sharp antithesis between the historical and the *experiential*, and is a species of subjectivism. In every mystic, as it must be with us, it is the reaction of the whole personality to objective truth that stimulates the mind and opens the way for God to come into consciousness within us. It is wholly gratuitous to argue that the mystic has no valid place for Jesus. He is

indispensable, not only as a criterion of reality and practical conduct, but as the mightiest stimulus to personality.

We hold, therefore, that the mystic with the vividness and intensity of his religious experience, his new insights, his practical devotion to humanity, and his certainty of God, has the form of religious consciousness greatly needed to-day. Such religious consciousness will clothe personality with an authority and forcefulness more effective than that derived only from technical studies or from dogmatic dicta. It will supply man with a moral passion that is convincing and fearless, tireless and commanding, genuine and forceful. It will root conduct in the Eternal Soul, it will derive ideals from Infinite Goodness. God, for such an one, will be not only immanent but transcendent. A revival and culture of mystical religion will be the best and surest antidote to the vagaries of Christian Science and Theosophy. It will prove a necessary balance for the prevalent externalism of life and practice by recovering the inwardness of vital religion. It will ever seek to conserve and utilize the outstanding achievements of the sciences, and inspire the right use of the products of the laboratory in saving civilization rather than in destroying it. We need not fear the mistakes of the past. To-day men are thinking of God in terms of Jesus Christ.

Believing then that we find God in Christ, let us join in offering the mystic's prayer of the fourteenth century:

"If my feeble prayer can reach Thee,  
O, my Saviour, I beseech Thee,  
Even as Thou hast died for me  
More sincerely  
Let me follow where Thou leadest,  
Let me bleeding as Thou bleedest,  
Die, if dying I may give  
Life to one who asks to live;  
And more nearly  
Dying thus, resemble Thee."

Such an abandon to Jesus will produce a self-dedication to God that will issue in a holy passion for truth and righteousness, for social justice and social service never surpassed by any age and restore to faith its legitimate experiential basis and necessary function in the conduct of personal life.

## The Desperate Deliverance

JAMES PERCIVAL HUGET

THE title of this article has been chosen not because of the allure of alliteration, but definitely to express the thesis that the higher faith may, and not infrequently does, rise out of the deeper despair. Its contention is that the grace of God in Christ, which is manifested to men in many ways and under many circumstances, is experienced with peculiar poignancy and power by those who have been brought by some bitter and tragic experience to a point where there remains no other refuge and no other hope. Its intent is to show how the profound doctrine of divine intervention is vindicated and exemplified in actual personal deliverance.

Confessedly such a consideration is attuned to a note which would be tragic if it were not sublime. It deals with the soul's dark hours out of which dawn its eternal mornings. It is concerned with losses so final and so complete that they are compensated for only by gains yet more complete and yet more abiding. For there are such gains, even though for some souls they are to be won only at a great price. There are possessions which lie on the other side of drear deserts or forbidding barriers. There are rewarding awarenesses and compensating certitudes attained only beyond and above the plains of untroubled and untried living. There are things the heart knows deeply only when we have gone over or under the separating ranges and planted our feet upon the rocks of reality.

There is a "beyondment" in faith, a degree and a kind of certainty and of commitment, which never lies on the easy slopes of the foothills of religion. It is possessed only by those who have acquired it by the paths of exploration and discovery. It lies across chasms and beyond precipices. It is on the farther side of wind-swept and perilous peaks.

More than that—it is not a spiritual territory claimed at the climax of some joyful adventure. It is found only by those who have been lost, abandoned, in despair. It is the resurrection of a hope that had been long entombed, the re-awakening of a soul that had fallen on sleep as deep and as dark as death.

This is no mere figure of speech. It is no emotional exaggeration. These things do happen. The De Profundis is no false note in the sublime

and terrible symphony of the soul. "Out of the depths have I cried unto Thee, O Lord," was and is an authentic utterance of the human spirit in its agony. And that cry from the deep is the final daring and the final vindication of faith. For faith in its fullest and most triumphant degree lies on the farther side of complete helplessness and hopelessness. An utmost faith is to be found only beyond an utter despair.

Here is an aspect of religious experience too little understood and too little valued by a soft and indulgent time, but which insistently re-emerges in individual trial or in social crisis. It is the paradox that the heights are sometimes reached by descent into the depths. It is the sobering and yet sustaining awareness of deliverance in desperation, of the rescue that is possible when all is lost, of the victory which emerges from utter overthrow, of a faith which is the Higher Despair.

The far-off kinsman of our own spirits who wrote, "though I walk through the valley of the shadow of death," was not dealing in mere rhetoric. He was recording an experience. He wrote not so much of what he feared might be as of what already had been. He knew because he had already known. So there are men who, while yet in this present life, have passed beyond the fear and the power of death. They have known death's desirability. They have known days and nights when to fall upon sleep would have been far more easy and far more welcome than the weary struggle to live. And, though men who have passed that way are prone to keep silence, so far as concerns their own dark hours in the valley of the shadow, they are for the sake of others sometimes moved to testify to the faith which is the strangely luminous morrow of their dark night of despair.

For there *is* a morrow. And there *is* a farther side to the valley of sorrow, another side to the mountains of defeat. The Psalmist walked *through* the shadowed valley—clear through it and out beyond its chill and its gloom. He is, then, the forerunner and the spiritual ancestor of all who have found light out of darkness and peace out of pain.

It was from such a promontory of spiritual adventuring that Paul wrote the familiar, but by many unplumbed, words at the end of the eighth chapter of Romans. Many men know these words and find comfort in them; a lesser number apprehend the terrors and anguishes which lie buried in their syllables, or the height and depth of the experience they portray. The Apostle is saying here not that the soul walks calmly and untouched amid life and death and the threatening and assault of named or unnamable foes,

but that these dire distresses beating upon the spirit drive it not away from but into the love of Christ. And out of that utter abandonment comes strangely at length a splendid audacity of soul. Fear is a thing of the past. The worst has been suffered. Slain all the day long and accounted as sheep for the slaughter, we are yet more than conquerors. The very threat has become a treaty, the seeming defeat a victory. Fate has no more arrows in her dire quiver. When all is lost, everything is gained.

But there is another and greater testimony. Our Lord himself came by dark hours to his dawn. It was night in the Garden and darkness covered Golgotha. The Cry from the Cross cannot be explained away. It was what it is recorded as being, the bitter cry of a soul in the last extremity. It was, then, indeed, that "He descended into hell," the deepest and darkest and most desolate place of loneliness and abandonment and despair. For Jesus did not stop with the lesser thing when he tested death for every man. It was not mere bodily pain and weakness and death. It was far more than that. It was something hard for us to think back to from the Resurrection side. It was before the Resurrection, before the Victory, before the Peace. It was the moment when more than at any other he shared not only our death but our despair. And it was then, when he also was driven back upon God, that he came to his perfect faith and trust and peace and cried again, "Father, into thy hands I commend my spirit!" On the farther side of the hours of darkness, on the farther side of Calvary's mountain, Jesus once again found God.

The "lama sabacthani" was a quotation from the twenty-second Psalm, but it was far more than a quotation. It has been called the last expression of his dying humanity. It was more than that. It was the call of a soul in agony, and that not the small pain of bodily dying, but the deeper torment of a real, however brief, despondency. And without that awful moment Jesus would not have shared to the bitterest our human loss and woe.

In and through that moment of utter aloneness Jesus passed to his own uttermost surrender to and faith in God, a commitment and a dependence which for him as for us is on the farther side of despair. And it was here that he became completely our Saviour, because it was here that he was completely saved—not saved from sin but saved from separation. And saved to perfect and peaceful trust in and obedience to God. Saved to that faith and that oneness which, though greater than ours as he is greater than

we, is like ours as he is partaker with us in the need of perfect trust in God and unfearing surrender to his will.

There are two kinds of faith. One is an acceptance. The other is an acquisition. The first is a gentle and gracious guide to willing feet. And there is no need to disparage the spiritual attainments of those who tread paths of pleasantness and peace, though even their happy confidence becomes more sure as the passing years prove its worth and its power to endure. No complete assurance can ever be possessed except by way of the testings and the attainments of actual living. And probably few, even of the serenest saints, reach their calm serenity without some haltings and hindrances, some questionings and doubtings and uncertainties, some burdens and battles. But as a whole, these children of peace have not been those who, like Browning, have "found it hard to be a Christian." To believe, to trust, to hope is for some placid souls, and for some gifted spirits too, the natural way of living. For such the steps in the ascent are easy, the upward slope gradual, progress uninterrupted and undelayed.

Perhaps all life should be like that. Doubtless Faber was right,

"If our faith were but more simple,  
We should take him at his word,  
And our lives would be all sunshine,  
In the sweetness of our Lord."

Yes, perhaps all life *should* be like that; but all life is not like that. But there is the other faith, not that of acceptance merely, but that of acquisition. It is won by hard battling. It is attained only at the price of struggle and pain. It comes of choices and decisions, of testings and experiments, of provings, of convictions and of resultant certainties. Something of this sort must have been in the thought of the Philosopher Poet when he wrote:

"and so I live, you see,  
Go through my life; try, prove, prefer, reject,  
Still striving to affect  
My warfare, rejoicing that I can  
Be tried and thwarted as a man,  
Not left in God's contempt apart,  
With ghostly, smooth life, dead at heart.  
Thank God no gate to Paradise stands barred  
To entry, and I find it hard  
To be a Christian as I said."

He was thankful for the very difficulties which make attainment worthwhile, and for the testings which prove and establish that worth. He found life meaningful and inviting because it is great enough to be exacting, because it is significant enough to make heavy demands upon courage and endurance. And anyone who has contended for his faith has in that very contest achieved and acquired a confidence and a certitude which is not less genuine nor less enduring than that which others approach by easier paths. The restful trust which is acquired at such great price is not easily taken away.

But if this were all, this paper never would have been written. There is another faith. It, too, is a faith of acceptance, for that is what all faith must finally be. And it is a faith acquired, for that, also, is what all faith must be if it is to be real. But yet it is something far other and something greatly more than either of these or both of these together. It is not won, not gained, not attained. It follows no triumph, yet it is the soul's greatest victory. It crowns no endeavor, yet it is the spirit's supreme achievement. It comes, and comes only, when all is lost, when the light is wholly gone out, when hope has ceased her song and even her sighing. It is the faith which lies beneath and beyond despair. It is found when the soul is wholly driven back on God. It is born in the moment when the soul turns in absolute dependence to him and to him alone. It is God's own answer to the call from the deep. "Out of the depths have I cried unto Thee, O Lord." For that desperate cry, that nethermost call, is in reality the claim of one spiritual being upon another. It is the ultimate upreach of the submerged but imperishable spirit, the appeal, almost the demand, for rescue and release. And with that claim upon God, that consciousness of the demand which weakness may make upon strength, which loss may make upon salvation, which desperation may make upon deliverance, comes a new life as from the dead.

From that full surrender and gracious liberation comes the steadfast hope of the soul that has known the meaning of the resurrection, having passed through the darkness of death to a new life hid with Christ in God. From that rescue comes the trust that will not and cannot waver because it has placed its dependence wholly and utterly upon the mercy of the Lord. From that depth of necessity comes the faith that cannot doubt because it knows both the abyss from which it has been lifted and the height to which it has been raised.

After all, life is different on the other side of the mountain. It is not just this side duplicated. Even if, like the men whom Andrea del Sarto envied because they reached many a time a heaven shut to him, they who have glimpsed the beyond "come back and cannot tell the world," it remains true that they have once passed the borderline and know that the hitherward side of experience is not all. And the Pilgrims of the Lonely Road who have once adventured beyond life's barriers are forever citizens of the realm which lies on the other side of the accustomed and the commonplace. Forever more, however contentedly they may dwell here, in their secret hearts they know that they are strangers and sojourners on the earth and have here no continuing city.

And for such souls there remains no place for bitterness or anger or hatred. This is the strangest thing about it, or perhaps it is not strange at all. For why should such things as malice or jealousy or enmity trouble a soul which has gone beyond even their power to follow? And certainly there is no place for the emotional indulgence of self-pity. The hurts and deprivations no longer are causes of regret. The rather, there is reason for humble gratitude for the very trials and sorrows, blunders and mistakes, injustices or betrayals by which the soul was driven to God, finding the final faith which is given in answer to utter helplessness and the peace which lies on the farther side of life's Gethsemanes.

"Faith," says Josiah Royce somewhere, "is the soul's insight or discovery of some reality which enables the soul to stand anything that can happen to it in the universe." That reality is God. And that discovery is sometimes made most fully and unmistakably when the soul is by some bitter loss driven back upon God. It is then that the world is strangely overturned so that loss becomes gain, the valleys are exalted, the lower depths become the loftiest heights, and despair is the gateway of deliverance.

# Good News for the Underprivileged

HOWARD THURMAN

HERE is no more searching question that the individual Christian should ask himself than this: What is the message, the good news, that Christianity has to give to the poor, the disinherited, the dispossessed? In seeking an answer certain basic historical facts must be taken into account. First, Christianity is an historical faith, the result of a movement that was started in time, by an individual located in history. Setting aside for the moment all metaphysical and theological considerations, simply stated, this individual was a Jew. That mere fact is arresting. Did it simply happen that as a result of some accidental collocation of atoms, this human being came into existence so conditioned and organized within himself that he was a perfect instrument for the embodiment of a set of ideals of such alarming potency that they were capable of changing the calendar, redirecting the thought of the world, and placing a new sense of the rhythm of life in a weary nerve-broken civilization? Or was there something basic in the great womb of the people out of which he sprang that made of him the logical funding of a long development of race experience, ethical in quality and spiritual in tone? Doubtless there is widespread agreement with the latter position.

He was a poor Jew—so poor that his family could not afford a lamb for the birth presentation to the Lord, but had to secure doves instead (*Leviticus 12. 8*). Is it too daring to suggest that in his poverty he was the symbol of the masses of men so that he could truly be Son of Man more naturally and accurately than if he had been a rich Jew?

As a poor Jew, Jesus was a member of a minority race, underprivileged and to a great degree disinherited. The Jews were not citizens of the Roman Empire and hence were denied the rights and privileges such citizenship guaranteed. They were a captive group, but not enslaved.

There were exceptions. The first great creative interpreter of the Christian religion was a Jew, but a Roman citizen. This fact is instructive in enabling us to understand the psychology of this flaming, mystic tent-maker with his amazing enthusiasm. It is demanding too much of human nature to expect that a man who was by blood and ties deeper than blood

—religion—a member of a despised group, could overcome that fact and keep it from registering in the very ground of his underlying interpretation of the meaning of existence. No matter where Paul happened to be located within the boundaries of the, then all inclusive, Roman Empire, he could never escape the consciousness of his citizenship. Whenever he was being beaten by a mere Roman soldier, doubtless hired to be the instrument of discipline and imperialism of the Empire, he knew that in the name of the Emperor he could demand the rights of citizenship of the Empire. He could appeal to Cæsar in his own right and be heard. It is to his great credit and a decided tribute to the "fragrance of Christ," of which he called himself the essence, that he did not resort to this more frequently. But there it stands, a distinguishing mark setting him off from his group in no uncertain fashion. Do we wonder then that he could say: "Every subject must obey the government authorities, for no authority exists apart from God, the existing authorities have been constituted of God, hence any one who resists authority is opposing the divine order, and the opposition will bring judgment on themselves . . . if you want to avoid being alarmed at the government authorities lead an honest life, and you will be commended for it; the magistrate is God's servant for your benefit. . . . You must be obedient, therefore, not only to avoid the divine vengeance but as a matter of conscience, for the same reason that you pay taxes. Since magistrates are God's offering bent upon the maintenance of order and authority" (Romans 13). Or again: "Slaves, be obedient to those who are your masters, saith the Lord, with reverence and trembling, with singleness of heart, as to Christ himself" (Ephesians 6. 5). Other familiar references could be quoted. Why Paul could feel this way is quite clear, when we remember that he was a Jew—yes, but a free Jew. But Jesus was not a free Jew. If a Roman soldier kicked Jesus into a Galilean ravine, it was merely a Jew in the ravine. He could not appeal to Cæsar. Jesus was compelled to expand the boundaries of his citizenship out beyond the paltry political limitations of a passing Empire, and establish himself as a Lord of Life, the Son of God, who caused his sun to shine upon Roman and Jew, free and bond. The implications of his insight had to be worked out on a narrow stage in the agonizing realities of the struggle of his people against an over-arching mighty power—the Roman Empire. *Christianity, in its social genesis, seems to me to have been a technique of survival for a disinherited minority.*

The meaning of his public commitment in the little Nazareth synagogue, when he felt himself quickened into dedication by the liquid words of the prophet of Deutero-Isaiah, is much to the point:

"The Spirit of the Lord is upon me:  
For he has consecrated me to preach the gospel to the poor,  
He has sent me to proclaim release for captives  
And recovery of sight for the blind, to set free the oppressed,  
To proclaim the Lord's year of favor." (Moffatt.)

What, then, is the gospel that this underprivileged One would proclaim to the poor and the disinherited? The first demand it makes is that fear should be uprooted and destroyed, so that the genuine power of the dominant group may not be magnified or emphasized. Fear is the lean, hungry hound of hell that rarely ever leaves the track of the dispossessed.

The dispossessed are a minority, sometimes a minority as to numbers, always a minority as to economic power and political control. They happen occasionally to be the balance of power, but even then, it is a matter of playing one element of the powerful over against the other. Because of the insecure political and economic position of the dispossessed, they are least able to protect themselves against violence and coercion on the part of the powerful. The fear of death is ever present. Men with healthy minds and fairly adequate philosophies do not fear death as an orderly process in the scheme of life. But it is exceedingly difficult for individuals to accommodate themselves to cataclysmic death at the hands of other men, not nature, without associating it with some lofty ideal or great cause. This is the lot of the dispossessed. Without a moment's notice any one of them may be falsely accused, tried, sentenced without adequate defense and certainly without hope of justice. This is true because the dispossessed man is without political and economic status as a psychological *fact*, whatever the idea of the state may specify to the contrary.

Fear becomes, therefore, a safety valve which provides for a release of certain tensions that will ordinarily be released in physical resistance. Physical resistance is almost always suicidal, because of a basic lack in the tools of violence and the numbers to use them. Fear is a natural defense because it acts as a constant check on the activities which may result in clashes and subsequent reprisals. Psychologically, it makes certain costly errors impossible for the individual and thereby becomes a form of normal

insurance against violence. But it disorganizes the individual from within. It strikes continually at the basic ground of his self-estimate, and by so doing makes it impossible for him to live creatively and to function effectively even within the zones of agreement.

Religion undertakes to meet this situation in the life of the dispossessed by seeking to establish for the individual a transcending basis of security which locates its center in the very nature of life. Stated in conventional religious terminology, it assures the individual that he is a child of God. This faith, this confidence, this affirmation has a profound effect upon the individual's self-estimate. It assures him of a basic status that his environment cannot quite undermine. "Fear not, those who can kill the body, but rather fear him who can destroy both soul and body," says Jesus. To say that this is merely a defense mechanism is not to render it invalid. Granted that it may be, although I do not think so, the practical results of such a conception are rich and redemptive.

This kind of self-estimate makes for an inner-togetherness, carrying within it the moral obligation to keep itself intact. It gives to the inner life a regulation that is not conditioned by external forces. In its most intensified form it makes of men martyrs and saints. Operating on the lower reaches of experience, it gives to them a wholeness and a simple but terrible security that renders fear of persons and circumstances ridiculous.

Again, this kind of relaxation at the center of life, growing out of a healthy self-estimate, gives to the individual an objectivity and detachment which enable him to seek fresh and unsuspecting ways for defeating his environment. "Behold, I send you out as lambs among wolves, you must be as wise as serpents and as harmless as doves." Often there are things on the horizon that point logically to a transformation of society, especially for the underprivileged, but he cannot co-operate with them because he is spiritually and intellectually confused. He mistakes fear for caution and caution for fear. Now, if his mind is free and his spirit unchained, he can work intelligently and courageously for a new day. Yes, with great calmness and relaxation, as sons of God, the underprivileged may fling their defiance into the teeth of circumstances as they work out their salvation with fear and trembling *as to God*.

Religion also insists upon basic sincerity and genuineness as to attitude and character. Let your words be yes and no; you must be clear and transparent, and of no harm to any one; have your motive so single that

your purpose is clear and distinct—such are the demands of religion.

This emphasis in Christianity creates the most difficult problem for the weak. It is even more difficult than the injunction to love your enemies. This is true because it cuts the nerve of the most powerful defense that the weak have against the strong—deception. In the world of nature, the weak survive because in the regular process of natural selection ways of deceiving the enemy have been determined upon and developed. Among some lower animals and birds the techniques are quite uncanny. The humble cuttlefish is supplied with a tiny bag of sepia fluid, and when beset by an enemy he releases the fluid into the water, making it to turn murky and cloudy. Under the cover of this smoke screen he disappears, to the utter confusion of his enemy.

Among many American Negroes, self-deception has been developed into an intricate subtle defense mechanism. This deception is often worked out with deliberate unerring calculation. A classic example is to be found in the spiritual, "All God's Chillun." The slave heard his master's minister talk about heaven as the final abode of those who had lived the good life. Naturally, the terror of his present existence made him seek early to become a candidate for a joyous to-morrow, under a very different order of existence. Knowing how hard and fast the lines were drawn between him and his master in this world, he decided that there must be two heavens; but no, for there is but one God. Then an insight occurred to him. While on earth, his master was having his heaven; when he died, he would have his hell. The slave was having his hell now; when he died, he would have his heaven. As he worked the next day chopping cotton, he sang to his fellow-slave: "I got shoes, you got shoes, all God's chillun got shoes (pointing to the rest of the slaves); when we get to heaven we're goin' to put on our shoes, and shout all over God's heaven. (No lines, no slave row there.) But everybody talking 'bout heaven (pointing to the big house where the master lives) ain't goin' there."

There are three possible solutions to the dilemma of genuineness as the underprivileged man faces it. First, deliberate deception and a naïve confidence that God will understand the tight place in which the individual is caught and be merciful. It is needless to point out what such a course may do to the very foundation of moral values. Traffic along this avenue leads to the quicksand of complete moral breakdown and ineffectiveness. The second possibility is an open frankness and honesty of life projecting

itself in a world-society built upon subterfuge and deceit. It is the way that is taken by the rare spirit in response to the highest demands of his nature without regard to consequences; for the average individual completely outside of the range of his powers as yet developed. It will mean stretching himself out of shape for the sake of ends that are neither clear nor valid. The third means accepting an attitude of compromise. The word is a bad one. No man can live in a society of which he does not approve without some measure of compromise. The good man is one who often with studied reflection seeks to reduce steadily to a vanishing point the areas of compromise within and without—while the bad man is one who often deliberately increases such an area without and within. The third attitude stated categorically is, absoluteness as to the ideal; compromise in achievement. This means that the battle must be fought to the limit of one's power in areas not fundamental to one's self-estimate and integrity. A line must be drawn beyond which the underprivileged man cannot go in compromising. Religion, with its cardinal virtue, sincerity, inspires the individual to become increasingly aware of, and sensitive to, the far-reaching significance of many of his simplest deeds, making it possible for him to act, in time, as though his deeds were of the very essence of the eternal. This type of action inspires courage and makes for genuineness at increasingly critical points. He is made to know that out of the heart are the issues of life and that life is its own restraint. With an insight overmastering and transcending, he becomes spiritually and practically convinced that *vengeance belongeth to God*. It becomes clear to him that there are some things in life that are worse than death.

The third demand that religion makes upon the underprivileged is that they must absorb violence directed against them by the exercise of love. No demand has been more completely misused. The keenest discrimination is quite necessary in the exercise of this prerogative of the spirit. It belongs in the same category as grace, the outpouring of unasked for and unobligated kindness without chartering it on the basis of objective merit. For the underprivileged man this often seems to mean cowardice and treason to his own highest group and personal interest. This particular emphasis of Christianity has many times been used by the exploiters of the weak to keep them submissive and subservient. For the man of power to tell the powerless to love is like the Zulu adage which says: "Full belly child says to empty belly child, be of good cheer!"

In examining the basic roots of the concept there are revealed three elements which are fundamental. Love always implies genuine courage. It is built upon an assumption of individual spiritual freedom that knows not the limitations of objective worthiness and merit. It means acting contrary to the logical demands of objective worthiness and character—hence the exercise of a kind of bold power, vast and overwhelming!

It means the exercise of a discriminatory understanding which is based upon the inherent worth of the other, unpredictable in terms of external achievement. It says, meet people where they are and treat them as if they were where they ought to be. Here we are dealing with something more than the merely formal and discursive, rational demand. It is the functioning of a way of knowing that Paul aptly describes as "having a sense of what is vital." Love of this sort places a crown over the head of another who is always trying to grow tall enough to wear it. In religion's profoundest moments it ascribes to God this complete prerogative.

It widens the foundations of life so that one's concept of self increasingly includes a larger number of other individual units of life. This implies the dramatic exercise of simple, direct, thoroughgoing imaginativeness rooted in an experience of life as one totality. Years ago, I encountered this quotation: "The statement, 'know thyself,' has been taken more mystically from the statement, 'thou hast seen thy brother, thou hast seen thy God.' "

In this third demand religion gives to the underprivileged man no corner for individual hatred and isolation. In complete confidence it sends him forth to meet the enemy upon the highway; to embrace him as himself, understanding his limitations and using to the limit such discipline upon him as he has discovered to be helpful in releasing and purifying his own spirit.

Only the underprivileged man may bring the message to the underprivileged. No other can without the penalty of the Pharisee. Jesus, the underprivileged One of Palestine, speaks his words of power and redemption across the ages to all the disinherited:

"Come to me, all who are laboring and burdened,  
And I will refresh you.

Take my yoke upon you and learn from me, for I am gentle and humble in heart,  
and you will find your souls refreshed;  
My yoke is kindly and my burden light."

# Happy Marriage

GEORGE STEWART

**I** AM writing from the angle of a minister. Half ashamed of the tip thrust into his hand by a condescending best man while the bridal party leaves the church exchanging knowing looks, the minister is apt to ponder long over what produces a happy marriage as he or the janitor sweeps out the rice and confetti.

Journalists, educators, psychologists and physicians are constantly expressing views upon marriage, its sanctions, its validity and its future. The minister, priest, or rabbi sees marriage and its consequences in as much detail and over as long a period as anyone. He is sometimes called in, much as a caterer would be, to bless marriages which are entered into "lightly or inadvisedly" and he is also asked to seal partnerships contracted with the highest motives of love.

In innumerable marital quarrels, which have increased with the complexity of modern life, he is consulted as a person the community as well as the church has set aside as one who is obligated to aid in any human situation where he is qualified to act. He knows that discord exists in gracious and conscientious homes, and that some apparently pagan households are examples of decorum, joy and beauty. He wishes that couples who come for the wedding ceremony could have some simple and precise instruction in the manners and methods which cannot guarantee but assuredly help make successful marriage. He is keenly aware that the church has never attempted constructively to produce happy marriage, although it has often laid down rules for divorce and remarriage.

Most ministers who face life with their eyes wide open believe that happy marriage is union—union in three areas or upon three levels of life, the physical, the intellectual and the spiritual, wherein each party makes an appropriate expression of his or her affection. Such a triangulation constitutes a more solid foundation than if man and wife depended upon union in only one area. Any attempt to say which is the highest or noblest of these three expressions only confuses the subject, for they are complementary. One without the others cannot be made perfect.

## I

The biblical idea, "Behold, I was shapen in iniquity, and in sin did my mother conceive me," has for many generations governed a large part of the thought of religious people regarding the physical aspect of marriage. But long before modern psychology and education had brought in a new idea of sex, clean-minded men and women have known that the utter, unashamed gift of themselves each to the other in marriage was not unclean but, in fact, the highest expression of human affection. Religious people may as well honestly acknowledge what decent folk have long known and lived by, that only in a happy physical love life together, based on mutual respect and mutual affection, can marriage reach its fulfillment.

Numbers of noble wives and husbands have held to the rule that there shall be no sexual intercourse except for purposes of procreation. I have known two families, and only two, where such an agreement did not bring suffering or such difficulties that divorce resulted. One family had no children at all, and the other only two. There may be dozens of families, perhaps thousands, who are living together on this basis, but they are only a handful compared with the total number of happily married people and are, according to universal psychological and medical authority, living under a detrimental and unnatural regimen. Normal human beings living together in intimacy are unable to stand the strain of such ill-advised celibacy, either physically, mentally or spiritually.

Such a plan is based upon a mistaken asceticism, or upon an essentially unclean idea of marriage. If the knowledge of these people about sex is traced back to its origins it will almost always be discovered that their early instruction was based upon distorted, untrue, and unclean ideas. Man, like trees, flowers, and his fellow animals, is essentially clean in his body and in its functions. Biologically and otherwise, man is made to live with woman, and woman is made to live with man. Those who wish to remain eunuchs for the sake of the kingdom of God, should never marry, for by the very fact of companionship and intimacy they inevitably subject a mate to the constant elicitation of a desire, a clean desire, never to be fulfilled, and this frustrated desire often compensates itself by a critical, persecuting habit of mind. Knowing not joy themselves, they unconsciously propose to destroy the happiness of others.

But some advocate of a restriction of sexual union save for procreation

will say that this simple, unembarrassed sexual life of man and wife together brings into the world unexpected, and thereby unwanted, babies. Unexpected many doubtless are. Some sociologists have estimated the number to be ninety per cent of all who are born, but this does not mean that such children are necessarily unwanted or unloved. The chances are, gentle reader, that you were an accident from the standpoint of any pre-meditation of your mother and father, but nevertheless you were probably nurtured and loved with as great affection as though you were anticipated with every care. Nature often over-rules the devices and desires of men and women, and takes away one thing to give something better in its stead.

But what about birth control? Can that be a practice which the church can approve? Certainly nine tenths of the members of the Protestant Church practice birth control, the Jews extensively employ contraception, many Catholic priests believe in it, and vast numbers of Catholic families make use of it although the Roman Church officially disapproves. The world is filling up with population. In many sections the laws of Malthus are now grinding. Despite Theodore Roosevelt's sentimental praise of emigrant mothers with twelve children, eight of whom they cannot possibly house, feed and rear properly, millions of children are born to poverty so degrading that they are inevitably conditioned for a beggared, often sub-normal or even criminal life. The plain fact is that religious, medical and social servants of our generation are largely occupied in caring for unfortunate beings who are cruelly handicapped for life. The church is apt to bless the marriage of any and every one, regardless of their biological fitness, the doctor keeps them alive to procreate their feeble kind, and the social worker spends his or her life getting them in and out of asylums, hospitals, rest homes and jails. Birth control is no longer a matter of experiment or speculation. It has come to stay. Can it be made an instrument for rearing a better race and developing happier marriages? That depends upon its sane use by all classes of the population.

The sad fact about birth control is that the best equipped in the community, the intellectually and quite often the physically and spiritually *élite*, are not rearing children, and the least fortunate and least able are spawning like bass. But, sad as this situation is, it cannot be corrected by limiting knowledge upon the subject, but by educating those who can only afford small families or who are unfit to bear children with the best scientific information available, and re-educating those who are physically, mentally

and financially able, as to their plain duty. A poor mother, worn out at forty by work and rearing a large family, is to be loved for what she has done and surrounded with every resource to bolster up her shattered health. A healthy married woman of middle age with ample means, who has refused to rear children in order to retain her so-called freedom, is an unworthy spectacle. Every age and condition has its own beauty in its own way, and none excels the beauty bestowed by parenthood.

Every minister is asked: "If sexual love is so important, why should not those who are thus attracted live together without the bond of wedlock? It leaves more freedom." The effective answer is derived neither from tradition, nor custom, nor the laws of the church—it goes to the root of our human make-up. Those who really love cannot achieve that peace of mind, that steadiness of emotions which they crave outside of a recognized status which promises permanence and security. Nor can they give a fair chance to children who might be born, regardless of the most scientific employment of contraception. And, what is equally important, experience proves that one party to such a fifty-fifty union will go on loving when the other party is satiated and ready to drop the relationship according to a prearranged plan. Love cannot be turned on and off like a spigot nor ordered for a certain date or hour like the morning's milk.

Marriage means physical union, simple, natural and unashamed—the caress of the lover of his beloved, that most precious gift man and woman can either give or take. When in due season they are blessed with children, they see in those radiant limbs the fulfillment of their clean and holy love.

## II

Marriage is also union on the intellectual plane. This does not presume that husband and wife must enjoy reading Greek tragedy together. Neither does it mean that they must give up their own special pleasures; nor does it mean that they must have identical tastes in books. It presupposes a common purpose, a sharing of ideas and enthusiasms about work, play and finance, and that there must be some general identity of intellectual outlook. It signifies that there is mutual respect and consideration one for the other, a hospitality toward ideas and opinions, one of the firmest bases of friendship within and without the marriage tie. Jealousy of each other's outside interests creeps in to corrode public service and is often a

cause of divorce. Nevertheless, outside activities which at their best are mutually encouraged often so devour all excess energy and possible leisure that nothing is left for the culture of that most delicate and sensitive relationship, the culture of love within the four walls of a home. No man can live on the praise his wife receives as head of some musical, political, civic or garden organization and no woman can be satisfied with the sleepy report her husband makes of the last great speech he has delivered to the Rotary, the Bankers' or the Manufacturers' Convention. Possessiveness is a fiend out of hell, but there is a gift of oneself offered and accepted, which if absent leaves a sterile waste, physically, mentally and spiritually. Countee Cullen struck a sound note in his lines:

I am too proud  
To owe you one caress; you must not drop  
Beholden to my favor for one least  
Endearing term. Should you reveal some stretch  
Of sky to me, let me revive some note  
Of music lost to you. This is love's way,  
That where a heart is asked gives back a heart.

A common purpose does not necessarily imply that she must tend counter in his store, keep his books or assist in his professional duties. Rather, it presupposes an identity of aim which will make sacrifice upon the part of either reasonable and attractive, that she gladly forego many social engagements because of his work, that he so arrange his schedule, no matter how difficult the process, that he may have time to give companionship to wife and children.

A man may well remember that his wife needs play as well as he. With woman's emancipation, she has come to a position where man, willy-nilly, must recognize her, not merely as keeper of his house and mother of his children, but as a free individual who *could* earn her livelihood but has voluntarily entered into a partnership which keeps her, unless she be a business or professional woman, long hours within the home. If she be a mother, she has given hostages to love from every standpoint. For him and their children she has gone through profound changes, in most cases laying aside much of her youthful grace forever. Because of this and her voluntary isolation from the varied contacts of the professional and business world, a wise husband provides his wife with occasions to be away from the scenes of her labors, both with and without him. He will find time to

accompany her to parties, to the theater, to hear good music, or to visit the houses of friends. Marriage is often preserved through years of unilateral sacrifice by one party, but it is best preserved when both appreciate the hours and work of the other, and find time for companionship in places and amid company not directly connected with their work.

Just how much time a man or a woman can give to philanthropic, political, dramatic, literary and spiritual activities without starving out the home is a matter for honest thought together between both parties concerned.

Nothing is ever gained by subordinating either party to a marriage. In America both men and women are often victimized by the motherhood cult which sentimentalizes motherhood out of all proportion and leaves many husbands wanting a mother rather than a wife. With the sentimental celebration of Mother's Day fostered by commercial interests, women are often led to believe that sacrifice is all on their part. A man, too, gives up a large measure of freedom and takes unto himself financial, social, emotional and physical burdens which are on the whole as taxing as those a wife must bear. A frank recognition of this fact would prevent many homes from becoming the scene of matriarchal tyranny, just as an honest recognition of a woman's life and work within a marriage will prevent any decent man from becoming a selfish bigot.

When husband and wife are wed mentally such union begets conversation rather than argument or oracular judgments handed down from his or her intellectual Olympus, about politics, art, literature, the children. The woman finds the joy of discovering another mind selecting and utilizing the raw materials of life, and the man discovers the value of insight by one who is willing to face the specters of the mind, emotional unsteadiness, poverty, or disgrace with him in what is often a sharp and stony path.

A meeting of the minds also means an agreement about family expenditures. Budgets often help, but seldom cover all the unforeseen items of expense. But if both have an intelligent idea of *income*, its sources and the probability of its increase or decrease, a rational amount to be laid by for saving, they are well on the way toward a workable adjustment on money matters, so familiar a bone of contention.

Many women never have a clear idea of family resources. For this they have themselves partly to blame as some women take pride in not knowing anything about money matters. Bankers will tell you there are

remarkably few women who can even balance their check books. In the present crisis hosts of women are embarrassed, humiliated and, in a sense, degraded when grim necessity has suddenly placed money matters sharply before them. The reluctant attitude of husbands toward household expenses bears heavily upon those who are often the chief spenders because they must buy children's clothes, pay the rent, maintain a clean and presentable house, and keep food on the table. A wise woman will see to it that she understands how and where the money comes from and how long it is liable to last. Anyone who deals with family problems knows how frequently they have their roots in money matters.

A determination to be tolerant of temperamental peculiarities which are often noticed only after marriage saves many cracking homes. We know now that most emotional twists and prejudices are caused in infancy. Wives and husbands are coming to understand this and meet exaggerated ideas and sentiments in a more rational and adequate manner. Such things are more easily forgivable when they are better understood. I have seen some dozens of couples about to apply for separation or divorce, come to understand the causes for their mates' moodiness and irritability and by honest discussion work through to a happy conclusion.

I have never seen a home which, on the intellectual as well as on every other plane, has not benefited by occasional separations of man and wife for vacations. Absence is sharply felt by both parties but it is worth the pain of parting. The loss of companionship for a day or a month is more than repaid in the stimulation of new ideas. The woman needs to see her friends without the presence of her husband, and *vice versa*.

### III

For the most enduring and fruitful marriages there is also union on the spiritual plane. And in the spiritual must be included the aesthetic in its deepest sense, for the upreach of the soul for beauty is qualitatively akin to the uplifting of hands in prayer. You may expect me as a minister to say that all men and women who are married should be regular in church attendance. I do not say that, but regardless of churchly prejudices, it is undeniable that church attendance and recurrent periods of group worship do furnish a reinforcement to life for which there is no substitute.

A rational and vital faith in God helps to keep love strong, and love, buttressed by faith and humility, is alone adequate for the strain of married

life. Women need such reinforcement when their husbands' work keeps them away from home for long periods, when wages are lean, when husbands have grown indifferent, when they themselves are daily growing more helpless in child bearing. A man needs such aid when his bride of yesteryear loses some of her beauty through work and through the bearing of their children, or when he is thrown constantly with careless and attractive women.

Faith also helps in making decisions which affect all the household. Whatever else prayer is, it brings a scrutiny of motives, a burnishing of loyalties, an attempt to see a problem *sub specie aeternitatis*, through God's eyes, as it were. The knowledge that man and wife are both seeking light and are willing to find and obey the will of God, places a decision in a realm where dispute is incongruous.

Faith brings an inner equipment which enables man and wife to face whatever life brings. Marriage is not all romance, although a great love makes hardship easier. Marriage requires a constant renewal of courage and grace which intellectual and social sophistication cannot provide. A man and woman are often confronted with illness, poverty, suffering, disability, unemployment, disgrace, which can only be mastered by rallying every resource of body, mind and spirit. If a couple find, through faith, that although they are living in a dangerous world it is nevertheless a world where ultimate values are conserved, that their Lilliputian struggles are mirrored on a stage of cosmic proportion, where they, in mimic struggle, are tiny replicas of the Titan efforts of God to achieve order and beauty and goodness, they take heart, together. In black disaster, when men and women of faith join hands, all things are bearable. Faith alone can bring that enhancement of character which can enable a family to handle prosperity and poverty alike.

On the spiritual side one cannot forget humor, a divine possession! Nine tenths of marital trouble could be prevented and happiness greatly enhanced if married people could see the comic side of their behavior. A lightness of touch enlivened by an eye for the absurd, the incongruous, the inconsequential would explode many an electrically charged situation in bland understanding rather than in violent words. I know one couple who have agreed whenever high words occur between them to go to a mirror and fight out the question there as before onlookers. The practice has proved effective.

There can be no discussion of marriage without reference to divorce. In so heterogeneous and hectic a civilization as we have in America many persons emotionally immature marry in haste. These quickly receive the reward of their lack of foresight. But there are many who are not guilty of thoughtlessness or of any moral taint who innocently are placed in a tragic or degrading situation. Morally and legally they furnish a situation which requires sane and just relief. It does not seem to me to lie within the law of love that those who have been for some grave reason disappointed, dissatisfied or degraded by one marriage should be denied a right to strive for a perfect union and partnership in a subsequent marriage. The living spirit taught in the four Gospels is that man shall have a second chance, and a second chance is important in marriage. In my experience I have found that divorced people, having learned bitter lessons, very often have homes of great beauty and harmony in their second marriages. This position can be maintained without lowering the standard of the perfect ideal of one marriage throughout life, by realistic and honest people. The main question to be asked is always: Does the remarrying of this person give a chance to strive for the ideal? Does it work injustice to children or to the ideal of marriage itself?

Sometimes people of strong character or those who are under the domination of ideas of others carry on for decades a marriage which violates the personalities of everyone connected with it. Edgar Lee Masters, in describing Mrs. Charles Bliss in his *Spoon River Anthology*, has her remark:

Reverend Wiley advised me not to divorce him  
For the sake of the children,  
And Judge Somers advised him the same.  
So we stuck to the end of the path.  
But two of the children thought he was right,  
And two of the children thought I was right.  
And the two who sided with him blamed me,  
And the two who sided with me blamed him,  
And they grieved for the one they sided with.  
And all were torn with the guilt of judging,  
And tortured in soul because they could not admire  
Equally him and me.  
Now every gardener knows that plants grown in cellars  
Or under stones are twisted and yellow and weak.  
And no mother would let her baby suck  
Diseased milk from her breast.

Yet preachers and judges advise the raising of souls  
Where there is no sunlight, but only twilight,  
No warmth, but only dampness and cold—  
Preachers and judges!

But some may say, "Where will we end up if we do not have a hard and fast law about divorce and remarriage? Everything will be in flux and confusion!"

The truth is, we are living in a confused society. It would be easier to tidy it up with a few simple maxims, but in doing so we would immolate the souls of many. We cannot turn back from the attempt to do justice just because the path is hard and requires straight thinking. There are many hasty, ill-mated marriages. These are a sin against love and an affront to society. The public is the third party in every marriage and has a right to be protected. Laws requiring public announcement in advance have proven helpful both here and abroad.

Now, for a moment, forgetting the world of parishioners and looking within the manse or the rectory, what do we find there in the way of marriage? Sometimes we see a man and woman who have gloriously approximated the ideal. Often the marriage is a meager affair, stunted, dried up, a tenuous thing, anemic and discouraged. Most often, whether the world thinks the person a holy man or not, the fault lies with us. What I have to say here about ministers' marriages is true of many professional people.

We take a presumably gay, young and attractive girl and throw her into an environment where in most parishes man and wife are surrounded with an artificial reputation for saccharine goodness, evenness of temper and earnestness which often embarrasses and compels that couple to conform to the sentimental, absurd, disproportional caricature of two persons created by the community.

The man becomes so inundated with other people's home problems that he assumes he has none, or forgets them. He brings home the tag ends of his personality after the day's study, writing and calling, and expects to be received as a hero.

Normal alternations and rhythms of life which make for work and play, gayety and seriousness, prayer and effort are apt to be ironed out with a dragging monotony, respectable, colorless, and accepted as a holy life.

Ill-nature, the vice of Christian souls trained to appraise and evaluate, creeps in to further smudge an already dull canvas.

A woman whose natural companions are sometimes quarantined away from her because she is the minister's wife must needs face her problem with high intelligence and a sacrificial spirit to solve it. It is as difficult to achieve happy marriage in a manse, upon the highest plane of romance, intelligence and spirituality, as it is in any professional home, if not more so.

We ministers are so prone to speak, so hesitant to listen. We often think we can solve the heartache in a woman crying out to live her own life as well as to serve others, by a two-minute sermonette, delivered through the bathroom door while we are shaving, or in tired grunts after we have stumbled home from a three-hour session meeting over thirty-cent affairs. It is so difficult for those in good work not to assume that they are good—so hard for the exemplar of all virtue to say, "Forgive, I am wrong."

Are these matters insoluble? Of course not—not where courage and intelligence unite in prayer for leading by an honest man and an honest woman who wish yet to realize their ideal for home and love.

For most sensible people happy marriage has come to mean union, physical, intellectual and spiritual, and in that union the clay of our humanity finds in each realm the nearest experience we know to heaven on earth.

One further observation is driven in upon those whose lives are thrown in daily contact with marriage and its problems—that the discovery of completeness of life in marriage is an acquired art which must be employed by both parties "until death us do part." Wilhelm Meister's word haunts us: "Art is long, life so short, the craft so hard to lerne."

## A Night in a Russian Monastery

JOHN SHERIDAN ZELIE

I HAD never known anything about Kiev but now in all Russia Kiev is "the home of my heart." My wife says that I am worse than a sailor with a sweetheart in every port and that some new place is always becoming the home of my heart. First it is Geneva and then it is Canterbury and then it is Chateau-Thierry and now it is Kiev. But she admits that I remain faithful and affectionate toward them all. I had never realized that Kiev was to Holy Russia what Jerusalem and Rome and Geneva and Canterbury were to their different countries and communions. But being there at last I realized that this was Russia's holy city and the place of her great shrines.

In the great famine which smote down upon thirteen millions of people, the Soviet Government, then only five years and very precariously in the saddle, overcame its reluctance to ask aid of a capitalistic government and at the instance of Maxim Gorky, so it is said, appealed to the United States government for an expedition of relief. In this philanthropy some sixty-five millions of dollars were expended.

The Federal Council of Churches had received immense gifts for Russian Relief while as yet there were no means of applying them and the expedition invited it to a seat on its staff to administer its aid where it would under their system. Its choice of where to expend it was an unheard of decision in Christian history. It chose the then persecuted Russian Church, thirteen hundred of whose priests and thirty of its Archbishops and Bishops had just been executed. No questions were raised about their dogmas, their non-intercommunion with us or the terrible black spots in their history. They were simply the major body of Russian Christians, they had always had their saints, they had acted swiftly under the Kerensky liberty to set their house in order by electing the first patriarch they had been allowed to have since Peter the Great, and he was already in prison. The moment of improvement was the moment of peril. The Federal Council had planned to give its action still greater value to this stricken communion by sending Bishop Brent. But the government did not propose to have these people still further enheartened by the presence of one of the greatest bishops in

Christendom and refused to have him sent. So, after a pause, I was sent in his stead.

To me for many years the most terrible person in modern church history had been Pobiedonostseff, Procurator of the Holy Synod, who had carried out the most hateful and relentless measures of the Russian Church. And here I was, administering the relief to that church. It should go without saying that the Federal Council and Archbishops Davidson and Lang knew as well as anybody about the tragedies, the crimes and the tyrannies which had historically blackened that church which had had neither renaissance nor reformation. They were no sentimental Russophiles blinking all the atrocities of its rule, but by years of conference with its struggling best elements, who were always there but never had a chance till now, they welcomed this opportunity to reach out a hand to it. As he sat that night in the drawing room of Lambeth Palace I was amazed at Archbishop Davidson's precise and extended knowledge of churchmen of the better type all over Russia, then in prison or exile, about whom and their families he asked me to find out more. In all orders of the church there were such people, and it was with the hope that this remnant should be cheered and helped against the possible far-off day when the church should be renewed and purified that this philanthropy was undertaken. The Jews had suffered so tragically from the Russian Church that I could hardly have expected any of them could look with favor on our enterprise, but one of them did. He was the administrator of the great Jewish Relief part of the expedition. And it was the surprise of my life when one day he took me aside and said, "I know what you are doing and what trouble you are having in doing it, but I want to say to you that there is not a class in Russia that needs it more and I would like to help you do it. You come down into the Ukraine. I know all the ropes down there and I will see that you have access to all the churchmen you desire." Could anything have been handsomer?

In Moscow I only dared meet a priest five times, in Petrograd not once, but carried on the work through intermediaries. But in the Ukraine, always more independent of Moscow than the rest of the country, the very morning of my arrival our Director came to my room to say that the Archbishop of Kiev had just come down from his great monastery in the hills, not to ask anything but just to render thanks for what the Americans had done for the Ukraine. Leaving me alone with this worn and venerable

man and his accompanying monk, I told him of my mission and who had sent me, that right now there was at their disposal all they needed, and that the only step to take next was to tell me just where the relief was to go. Of all human astonishment I ever saw his was the most complete. He had heard nothing about it. With the tears falling down his cheeks he tried to tell me what this meant to him and to his people. On the afternoon of the same day in his study, which was what was spared to him of his home in the monastery of Saint Michael, the greatly loved Bishop Dmitry sat quite stunned behind his table as I asked him to send me the lists of the people to be helped.

Every few hours someone, finishing his errand with me, was sure to ask, "Have you yet seen the Great Lavra?" Excessive occupation, which sometimes lasted past midnight, and fear of collision with Soviet authorities had made me give up all thought of seeing their greatest shrine, the Pecherska Lavra Monastery. But when at length a deputation of three monks came down from the monastery and sat formally down before me to press an invitation, I gave way and next day at early evening I ascended the heights above the Dnieper for a visit which was to last until after midnight. My liveliest anticipations had not prepared me for the splendors which, at the last turn of the road, lay spread before me as I looked down upon this monastic city, for such it really was. There, in the late afternoon sun, glowed this gorgeous monastery of the Pecherska Lavra which had been the goal of millions of pilgrimages through the ages. It was a vast and unsymmetrical scene of dormitories and refectories, of palaces and dwellings, of libraries and chapels and churches, of turrets and towers, steeples and domes and crosses and in the midst its great cathedral, covered with paintings and decorated in blue and gold and nearly every other hue.

From boyhood I had been fascinated by the romance of the monastery. And now I thought of Goethe's maxim: "That which a man desires in his youth, he shall in his age see as much of as he will." We drew up at the great portal in the wall and there the Abbot and the Archivist stood to receive us. I had never forgotten Dean Stanley's rapture over the Russian Church and theirs over him and how, when years afterward he came again, aged abbots, on hearing his name, had cried out with enthusiasm, "Stanley! Stanley!" and rushed to embrace him. So when the courtly abbot kissed me on both cheeks I knew what to do and returned his greeting. The Archivist and I exchanged profound bows. Escorting me within the great wall they

bade me turn to look at the resplendent tower under which we had entered and the glories began. We passed slowly down a broad turf-bordered walk, flanked on either side by vast wall paintings hundreds of feet in length, and then on through lines of monastic dwellings. The wonders were so unceasing that our progress was slow and we were talking every minute, and from the first minute I felt absolutely at home. The Abbot looked up at me and said, "Are you a priest?" "No, I am a pastor," I replied, and with that he laughed, he shook his head, he tugged at his beard, as if he could never get used to this, the most unbelievable thing he had ever heard of. "How *could* such things ever be? You a pastor and representing millions of your people, coming way over here to help us when we thought we had not a friend in the world!" And at intervals the good soul would go through it all again. He could not get used to it but he liked it.

At last we approached the cathedral. The monks were waiting on the steps to receive us. I was introduced to them one by one. They were full of cordiality and curiosity. A sadly reduced number they were now. Then the Abbot bade me pause outside and listen. The Great Vespers were being sung within and the glorious Even Song of the Eastern Church came booming out like the surf upon the shore. Then entering, we all moved up and stood together before the sanctuary and listened and watched as those great voices continued their splendid office. We passed over to a side chapel as large as a church. In the midst of its darkness I saw a white blur which I could not make out until, the Abbot leading me nearer, I saw that it was a confessor holding a white cloth over his own head and that of a penitent as he received the confession after the Eastern manner. Approaching a great brazen coffin on its pedestal against the wall the monks threw back the cover and exposed the mummified body of one of their chief saints, wrapped in his vestments, and one of them passed his hand reverently and familiarly over his body, as they explained to me his history. It is one of their superstitions that if the man is a saint his body is not touched by decay.

And next they must show me the Treasury. So we passed again through the waves of the Great Vespers and down a long dark corridor at the end of which there was such a clanking of great keys and drawing of bolts and bars as to make me feel that I was back in the middle ages. But I had at times felt the same way in some of our own ecclesiastical gatherings when some good brother would dig up some outworn usage, set us back five or six hundred years at a stroke and hold us there for hours over his inconsi-

quential find. In this great chamber, lighted from high windows, there were spread the accumulated treasures of centuries, the gifts of untold numbers of devotees. The arm of the new state had already reached in and removed all the gold and silver which was in negotiable shape. It had not been done violently but by the hands of skilled artisans. The monks never said a word about this. They simply pointed to some great Bible or service book whose covering of gold or silver or gems had been taken away. They opened the immense iron-bound circular trunk which contained their choicest vestments. The Roman Church is almost plain and puritan in its vestments compared with Holy Russia. They let me turn them back and examine them as long as I chose. A closet contained shelf after shelf filled with the crown-shaped mitres in every conceivable variety of goldsmith's work. The ikons alone would justify a book, for though the Eastern Church broke with Rome over the lawfulness of "any graven image," among other things—a flat surface or picture being all that was allowable without breaking the commandment—they luxuriate in ikons, which in number probably exceed the Roman images fifteen to one. The ikon might be of any size from a watch charm to some gold or silver splendor which would cover a wall. The lesser vestments, the chalices, the censers, the spoons, the spears, and all the intricate apparatus of the Divine Liturgy as they like to call the Mass, missals and Bibles of every size and adornment, and reliquaries—just to name them is dull compared with the workmanship and beauty which made every one of them a work of art.

I know how the born and bred evangelical is traditionally expected to start back in disapproval at the sight of such material aids to the worship of God, but I never started back an inch; rather I pressed forward with more and more wonder. It may be more spiritual to worship in the conference room of one of our very best churches, as I have often done, where all the discarded pieces of furniture for years back are still stacked up around the worshipers, and slatternly piles of disused hymnbooks fill the window sills and remainders from the sewing society crowd the spaces at the back, while the folding tables for some impending church supper are folded up against another wall. It may be. But having in my time accepted such surroundings without complaint I make bold to say that faith can probably just as easily surmount the alleged obstacles of great beauty, prepared at great cost, as it can surmount the obtrusive and unsymbolic paraphernalia of the janitor and church repairs. And as for incense, though I never use it, it

would be just as little of a hindrance to me as the lingering odors of coffee, baked beans and chopped cabbage from which our endless church suppers hardly ever leave the sanctuary quite free.

In the midst of the Treasury they now brought forth what seemed to be almost their most priceless relic. It was a square of old and stained and rusty fabric without beauty, and as they carefully laid it out to view they explained that it was the cloth upon which the sacrament is spread for the consecration. They were quite fearful lest I should not understand. Perhaps I would if they only knew the Latin name for it, but they could not remember what that was as they asked each other and were surprised and delighted when I said, "Mensa, perhaps?" Yes, that was it. In dim bygone ages some of their great saints had celebrated upon that timeworn cloth. We had gone, all too briefly, the circuit of these treasures over which one might have spent days, and now at the end, as if some special honor were about to be bestowed upon me, the Abbot approached me with the bishop's staff in his hand and asked me to hold it in mine. Their staff is different from the familiar crozier or shepherd's crook of the Western communions and branches out at the top into a double-headed serpent. Their symbolism and habits and dress are full of Old Testament reminders. I held it and bowed to them and then examined and admired it and finally I asked them if it was all there. Was there not something missing? And with that they all looked at each other in surprise and then broke into smiles and laughter. What a question from this Presbyterian stranger! How could he ever have known? At once a monk detached himself from the group, sped across the Treasury to bring what had been forgotten, and while they were yet laughing the Abbot attached the missing ornament to the staff and gave it back to me again. But, now, would I mind if he asked me how I ever came to know that anything was missing? Just how did it happen? I told him that from boyhood I had had a very inquisitive disposition and a lively interest in things that did not strictly concern me and especially anything in the way of an ecclesiastical curiosity. So I held the staff a few moments longer and tried to imagine myself as Archbishop and Metropolitan of Kiev and Exarch of All Galicia.

Crossing the cathedral plaza we ascended into a vast pagoda-like tower which was the library. The treasures of that too were past telling. On the pillars hung the portraits of their great saints and ecclesiastics, and when singling out one of them I remarked, "Ah, there is Flavian," a monk

spoke up and said, "What, and you know Flavian too?" But Flavian's countenance had by now become very familiar. It should be said to the credit of the Soviet government that in the main it has carefully guarded the great collections of books and paintings and of course even enriched them by the confiscation of such as were privately owned. The Hermitage at Petrograd is a greater gallery than ever before.

From the library we passed over to another building which seemed to be the place of the archives. Here all around us lay exposed, beneath their glass, charters and documents with the signatures of all the great names of their history—Ivan the Terrible, Catherine, Peter the Great and others in endless array. And at length we all drew together in an open space and the Abbot asked me if I would not address them. I felt as if I were living in a dream. A Presbyterian minister, New England born, Congregationally ordained, standing there near midnight in the very heart and center of Holy Russia and speaking familiarly to these monks of that Eastern church! Sometimes I almost felt as if I were associating with Abraham, Isaac and Jacob. And at other times, in spite of their long hair and beards, their high black headdress with its flowing veil and the beautiful ikons suspended upon their breasts, in general tone and manner they seemed like the very old-fashioned, very dignified New England parson. So I addressed them, telling about these many churches at home which had acted together in this Federal Council and sent this relief, as "knowing their sorrows," and how they had hoped at first to cheer them by sending that great bishop, Brent, but had been prevented. They had felt themselves forgotten and perhaps repudiated by all Christendom. And then I went on to give them at length the messages of concern and constant interest in their situation which the Archbishop of Canterbury, Davidson, had committed to me in a long evening with him at Lambeth Palace for which he had invited me. I told them of the inquiries he had bidden me to make about distressed individuals, of the Archbishop's noble speech in behalf of their Patriarch which he had made in the House of Lords. And to these the further messages of the then Archbishop of York, Doctor Lang, which he gave me for them later on during that Lambeth evening. I watched their faces as my interpreter went on and when the interpreter said the words "Canterburiensky" and "Yorbsky," they looked as if they had heard from old friends. Just when they thought they were forsaken, these messages from the Christians in America, from the Archbishops, the gifts of

food already in their homes, produced as concrete an experience of relief as I have ever seen. Dangers in plenty surrounded them even then and were swiftly materializing, but for the time being they took heart of grace and it was good to see them. Then the Abbot Nicolai stood forth to reply. He begged that everywhere I went when I reached home I would let all our people know what ARA had done for their land and that every little child in Russia knew that name as a household word. (ARA was the abbreviation for American Relief Association.) But what the churches of America had done for their church in Russia when no one else was caring for them could never be forgotten in all their future history. As he closed he stepped forward, and holding in his hand some object which he had removed from one of the cases around us, said that he was presenting me with this silver pectoral cross, seven hundred years old, and for himself and his brethren of the Pecherska Lavra begged that I would always wear it on my person in remembrance of them.

They plied me with endless and friendly questions and then as it was nearing midnight and as one always had to feel a bit nervous, things being what they were, I spoke of descending again to "The God-Protected City of Kiev" as they always called it in all the documents they addressed to me. But no. My visit had by no means reached its climax. I had not yet seen their catacombs. They had been saving this for the last. Without this their hospitality could not be complete. I hesitated much over this. Catacombs, at midnight, and in the depths of the earth, seemed something I had better omit. But this would be a sharp disappointment evidently, and so we walked through long streets of vast dormitories and buildings of every shape and hue and wonder until at last we came to a great iron door set in a steep bank and passed into a vestibule where the candles were lighted and then, single file in the midst of the monks, I began to descend through a rather narrow aisle into the depths. On either side of the aisle were loculi in the walls containing the mummified bodies of the saints exposed to view, wrapped in their vestments. Here we paused for the story of some martyr, there for the history of some saintly child, or again to examine some tiny cell where some holy man had dwelt below ground for an incredible time of prayer and fasting, as Saint Simeon Stylites spent it far above ground. At last the long descent came to an end in what I think might be the tiniest church in all Christendom. But it was perfect in every appointment. This was perhaps the holiest spot in the shrine of the Lavra. I asked the Abbot

if the service was ever said there now and he replied proudly, "Yes, every single day. It is never omitted."

It was past midnight as, returning, we walked by the palace of the Metropolitan Michail. I never saw the poor old man again. And when a week later I had dispatched a secretary to tell him of still further measures of relief which were coming to him, she arrived at his palace just in time to see an automobile with the curtains down swing around the corner of the palace and disappear. It contained the archbishop. His hour had come and the old man was being carried away, none knows whether to imprisonment, exile or death. The Abbot accompanied me to the gates. A little later he sent me a picture of himself among his choir boys. And weeks afterward, when I was back in Moscow, word came that one night he had been murdered in his cell.

On the afternoon of the next day the three monks came and ranged themselves before my table again. They had with them a parcel which they held reverently and were slow to open. Then one of them proceeded to explain that that morning in the cathedral the Divine Liturgy had been sung for their friends in America and myself. And they had brought with them to present to me the sacrificial loaf from which the bread of the sacrament had been taken. It is a hard loaf, shaped somewhat like an hour-glass. The portion for the sacrament is removed from it in a pyramidal form by three thrusts of a spear and the loaf then set to one side on the altar. On the underside of the loaf had been painted in beautiful red lettering the inscription in Slavonic, "Health and Salvation to the Presbyter John."

On the night of the same day, in the vast hotel which was our headquarters, I was working after midnight alone, save for the presence of the secretary and the Red guard who had been set over us as we worked at the food lists, when the door suddenly opened and in came one of the monks of the Lavra with a large bundle. He looked wild and haggard and sat down without a word. The secretary said that he was a very learned man who had suffered much and that it was best to let him alone until he was ready to speak. So we went on with the lists until at last he said abruptly, "When will you look at these things?" And when I replied, "Now," he opened his bundle. It was gifts from the Lavra of pink and silver vestments for the Mass, an eighteenth-century epitrachil of gold embroidery, the long front vestment of all the priesthood which hangs underneath the

robe, a set of vestments in gold and red velvet, a silver mounted missal with elaborate silver feet on which it rested, with an affectionate inscription within from the chapter, prayer books and ikons, crosses and rosaries. And then, just as abruptly, he departed into the night. There was not enough they could do, from Petrograd to Odessa, to show their gratitude to the Americans. A week later they had gone still further. In some way, which I never knew, perhaps through my interpreter, they had obtained my photograph, and they now brought me a beautifully executed parchment with a portrait of myself painted at the side and backed by palms and the American flag. At the top was an exquisitely painted miniature of the monastic city of the Lavra and beneath it in gold lettering worthy of a missal their tribute to the Americans and their messenger. In an oaken case, with folding doors and lined with red satin, the monastery of Saint Michael sent an ikon of Saint Michael. On the day of my departure from Russia the imprisoned Patriarch Tikhon sent me from the Dunskoy Monastery, where he was confined, an ikon of the Christ set in the episcopal purple. And still later on came the great jeweled golden cross of the Metropolitan and Archbishop Benjamin of Petrograd which he always carried in his hand, with which he gave the Blessing of the Waters. It had been lifted over the multitude in all his great ceremonies. Benjamin (Venniamin) was one of the noblest of the bishops, chosen in recognition of his interest in and devotion to the people. He had boldly withheld some of the iniquities of the new régime and had suffered the penalty of death.

It is one of the innumerable paradoxes of our time that this great Eastern Catholicism should, on the one hand, be effecting recognition and intercommunion with the Church of England, and on the other, be in constant and friendly advisory consultation with these evangelical churches through the Federal Council, one of whose committees is in communication with the Russian Church whenever possible as well as with the other Patriarchates of the East.

## A Minister and His Books

THOMAS WEARING

"A MINISTER neglects current literature at the expense of his ministry." This statement came under vigorous Monday morning flailing at a meeting of an interdenominational ministerial group. In the exchange of opinions, it was revealed that only three out of the seventeen ministers present practiced general reading outside of denominational periodicals and daily newspapers. One of the three confessed to devouring two or three books a week and colored his confession considerably by adding that these were detective stories. Only two of the group had any intimate acquaintance with contemporary literature.

It has often been a matter of perplexity to me that not a few move through our various educational institutions and into the ministry without a love of literature in its deeper meanings and in its wider reaches. On being asked why he spent money on what seemed personal and domestic luxuries when his home was so bare of good books, a young minister solemnly voiced his conviction that "if the Lord wanted his servant to possess a library some heart would be touched to provide the necessary volumes"—a specimen of self-deception met too frequently even in this age of ministerial literacy. Another preacher sees no object in scrimping himself to buy books when he can borrow them from the public library. Later he admits failure to profit very much by this plan for the reason that his tendency is to keep a book beyond the loan limit and to feel deep chagrin when making settlement. Was it not Erasmus of Rotterdam who was accustomed to say, "First I buy books and afterwards I buy clothes"? The author of *The Imitation of Christ* has written that one of his deepest desires was met by "libellus in angulo." I recall a theological student going hungry one day in order to bring back to his study a long-coveted book—discovered down town at a miraculously reduced price—and forgetting entirely his physical pangs in the glow of literary possession. A distinguished librarian, in a recent volume of essays, relates early privations in acquiring his own personal collection. Next to Boswell's "Johnson" on his shelves at home stands a one-volume Shakespeare. In early married life his household goods had been lost in a shipwreck; among other books a three-volume

Shakespeare. He writes: "Times were hard and book buying seemed out of the question. Yet even a small house without a Shakespeare seemed unthinkable." Finally this book-lover, on a lecturing tour, poorly paid, managed to save the cost of a sleeping berth by sitting up throughout a night's journey, this covering the purchase of his treasured one-volume Shakespeare. At bottom it is the personal bent toward reading that counts for the minister. With this he will not wait for gift volumes. Nor will he decorate his shelves with the sets recommended by some loquacious and particularly plausible vendor of "books every minister ought to own."

The chapter on "Forming a Library," in A. Edward Newton's *End Papers*, is worthy of special note. Mr. Newton writes with feeling: "God forbid that I should say a word against a public library, but nothing will take the place of a rack or a shelf full of books by one's own chair, close to a well-adjusted light, whether it be a lamp or a window. Everyone's shelf will contain different books, and the books which give joy to youth may not delight age, but the pleasure of reading continues." The author's argument for a private collection appears in connection with the announcement that he is perpetuating at Swarthmore College a fund which annually provides fifty dollars to the student who, during a specified period, gets together "the best, not the largest, collection of books in one or more department" in which he or she is specializing. The student must evince appreciation of "the joy of ownership" by his selection and by his care of the books. The first award made by Mr. Newton called forth comment concerning the student's collection. "There were no sets, but a better-selected lot of books—poetry, essays, fiction, and biography, a hundred or so—I never saw."

Such a plan at work in theological institutions would mean much for the leadership of religious life in the world of to-morrow. It would set each student thinking seriously in this area. Many young ministers would get a start toward a choice library and an informed acquaintance with literature bound to emerge in wider culture and wiser conclusions in the course of a busy public career. I know of an arrangement, now discontinued, by which students graduating from a professional school for the training of ministers received the sum of fifty dollars for the purchase of books as a foundation for a library at home. This plan, praiseworthy as it was in its purpose, perished by reason of the fact that in the majority of cases the love of books was so slight or the pressure of financial obligations so formidable that the intent of the award rarely ripened into the deed. The Swarthmore

prize, with the same purpose and sum involved, is on a much better basis, and is far more likely to achieve its worthy end.

If a project of this sort were put into operation, it ought, in my opinion, to avoid special reference to literature strictly theological. The emphasis ought not to be upon the kind of book a young minister might buy for practical purposes definitely relating to pulpit and pew; rather ought it to be in the field of general literature, with religious books as a part—and an important part, to be sure—of the literary interest. Aldous Huxley has given us in cynical vein a sketch of a minister's library. Of course it is harsh and unlovely, but the various forbidding features this writer brings forward are not unfamiliar to folk who frequent the homes of those who carry on the preaching traditions of Christianity. "In spite of the brilliant July weather, the room was sombre. Brown varnished bookshelves lined the walls; filled with row upon row of those thick, heavy theological works which the second-hand booksellers generally sell by weight. The mantelpiece, the over-mantel, a towering structure of spindly pillars and little shelves, were brown and varnished. The writing desk was brown and varnished. So were the chairs, so was the door. A dark red-brown carpet with patterns covered the floor. Everything was brown in the room, and there was a curious brownish smell."

Turning from *Crome Yellow* to Harry Emerson Fosdick's *Twelve Tests of Character*, we find the same general subject set forth in trenchant, homiletic style. "Possession is sending down town, as one woman is said to have done, for three yards of good books in brown bindings to match the furniture; ownership is saying with Fénelon, 'If the crowns of all the kingdoms in Europe were laid down at my feet in exchange for my love of reading, I would spurn them all.' Possession is having a morocco-bound copy of Wordsworth that you never look at; ownership is having Wordsworth, it may be in paper covers, a source of inextinguishable delight." In the best language of the nineteenth century English pulpit, F. D. Maurice has given advice well worth remembering by the young minister while selecting his library. He declares that some of the contemporary histories are "books in the truest sense of the word. They illustrate great periods in our own annals, and in the annals of other countries. They show what a divine discipline has been at work to form men; they teach us that there is such a discipline at work to form us into men. That," the great preacher adds, "is the test to which all books must at last be brought; if they do not bear

it their doom is fixed. They may be light or heavy, the penny sheet or the vast folio; they may speak of things seen or unseen; of Science or Art; of what has been or what is to be; they may amuse us or weary us, flatter us or scorn us; if they do not assist in making us better and more substantial men, they are only providing fuel for a fire larger, and more utterly destructive, than that which consumed the library of the Ptolemies."

How much of contemporary literature the minister ought to read and how much of this ought to find place in his bookshelves are questions each individual must answer for himself. With the various devices adopted by modern purveyors of books there are many opportunities of sampling the product in almost every field of general literature. To enter sympathetically into the life of his time the minister ought to read widely and then with extreme care select such material as is likely to make him a "better and more substantial" man. He will shun so-called "easy reading," which David McCord calls a "wicked name." "There was never any easy reading," he tells us. "When reading is easy it is only a waste of time." He must turn the critical searchlight of a growingly cultured intelligence upon the literature of his day, finally choosing what stimulates him to larger living and setting aside that which has a tendency to disintegrate and frustrate the longings and outreachings of the spirit as it quests for the divine in all its manifestations. In criticizing a much discussed author of the present day, one of our literary pathfinders refers to the type of reader "who is driven by a strange demonic urge to wallow savagely in the rank ooze of the great river-bed of modern life; in its slang, its psychological catchwords, its mechanical toys, its circus manias, its brutal eroticism." Professor Luccock's treatment of contemporary literature in this country, notably in the chapter on "Soundings," is careful to point out the prevalence of such meretricious material, especially in the fiction of to-day. Poetic and prose comment by James Norman Hall and Henry Seidel Canby, as quoted in this chapter, will bear serious reflection and repeated reference. Only a wide acquaintance with the best in the literature of the past can adequately prepare the reader with suggestive standards of taste and judgment in testing the worth of what he may read and what he may rely upon in meeting the problems of his own life and the problems other lives may present to him in his spiritual mission to mankind. T. S. Eliot in The Charles Eliot Norton Lectures for 1932-1933, when beginning his discussion of "The Use of Poetry," passes a stricture upon "the criticism of our time, a criticism which seems to demand

of poetry not that it shall be well written, but that it shall be 'representative of its age.' " Then this foremost poet of our period ventures a wish "that we might dispose more attention to the correctness of expression, to the clarity or obscurity, to the grammatical precision or inaccuracy, to the choice of words whether just or improper, exalted or vulgar, of our verse; in short, to the good or bad breeding of our poets." The hint of reference to dependable standards in this connection may very well be taken as applied to reading and study in all the areas of modern artistry in literature, whether poetry or prose.

In a religious weekly commanding a wide circulation among folk of many levels of culture there appeared recently a rather dubious recommendation of a book just off the press. After outlining the plot the reviewer concluded with this sentence: "It is a novel, but one that you will enjoy." The adversative conjunction is arresting, also the implied motive for reading in the area of fictional narrative. Both suggest inhibitions and escapes that persist as hardy perennials in spite of considerable cultivation due to modern educational processes. William Lyon Phelps, in the January Scribner's Magazine, includes in his department an account clipped from a Michigan newspaper: "Grandma Sadie Ettinger of Brady claims to hold the readin' championship of that township. She claims to have read Anthony Adverse straight through without skippin' a word in the third attempt, in two hours and thirty-four minutes. This comes close to being the world's record, it is claimed. Grandma Ettinger, who is eighty-two, reads without her glasses and without understandin' most of the time." Professor Phelps is sure his readers will relish the item. Some student of literature might hazard the suggestion that the picaresque novel of the present maintains the traditions of the country and the period whence it came, the "novela píquesca" being invented, we are told, to while away idle hours without imposing a heavy burden upon feminine minds. To watch a somewhat pathetic figure being projected through the polyglot harlotry and poltroonery in the social maelstrom of the Napoleonic period is to conclude that amazing capacity for research coupled with undoubted poetic power might have been employed to better purpose.

Augustine Birrell, in *More Obiter Dicta*, while discussing strictures passed by a literary periodical upon popular tastes in reading, is led to observe that people who lead dull lives long for excitement in the books they read. He continues: "Nobody nowadays reads *The Mirror of Knight-*

hood," which is the English translation, in nine volumes, of the Spanish romance, once in Don Quixote's library, *Espejo de Príncipes y Caballeros*. It would be rather difficult to read it, even were one so minded, for Mr. Bullen, in his Preface to *Lyrics from Elizabethan Romances*, tells us that only one perfect copy is known to exist, and that is in the Bodleian, where reading is discouraged. "But in Elizabeth's days," adds Mr. Bullen, "the book was highly esteemed, particularly by romantic 'prentices and waiting maids. Sir Thomas Overbury, in his character of 'A Chambermaid,' tells us, 'She reads Greene's works over and over, but is so carried away with *The Mirror of Knighthood* she is many times resolved to run out of herself and become a lady-errant'. . . . As long as the world remains what hitherto it has always been, people will read, as Sir Thomas Overbury's chambermaid read *The Mirror of Knighthood*, not to improve their minds, but in order 'to run out of themselves.' These books will ever be the world's favorites which make their readers run fastest."

Of course, the well-meaning but narrow-minded objection to novel reading of any kind is not a new attitude. Vida Scudder, writing on "Plato as a Novelist," has an introductory passage that is pertinent here. "How far behind us," she exclaims, "seem the days when the future author of *Adam Bede* wrote sedately to a youthful friend that she read no novels, because 'the weapons of Christian warfare were never sharpened at the forge of Romance!' Whatever be true of Christian warfare and its weapons, novels are nowadays a necessary and wholesome part of everyone's daily life. Did they serve no other purpose, they afford an invaluable gymnastic of the sympathies. Reading them, we acquire with minimum effort a broadening of our affections, a liking for all sorts and conditions of people, including not a few crooks, drunkards, fools, even, from whom in real life we should turn with disgust and distaste. If we moderns are growing more inwardly democratic, if we take life with more emotional versatility and humorous tolerance than our forbears, we owe the gain less to our political institutions than to our excellent habit of indiscriminate novel reading." Perhaps the essayist strains a point in stressing the uncritical character of the general approach of modern readers to fiction in order to picture Plato as a novelist par excellence. She certainly allows George Eliot to misrepresent herself in the epistolary reference. Mary Ann Evans must have been in a singularly militant mood when she penned the words so quoted. They may have been written in the same period and mood as brought from her the

wish to ban all music from religious gatherings, "except perhaps in strict worship." Yet at eight years of age she found the novels of Sir Walter Scott most absorbing; she even adored *Rasselas*, that somewhat stilted saunter through the field of fiction taken by the ponderous Doctor Johnson "To cover the cost of his mother's funeral" and for which he is said to have received a hundred pounds. Critics have maintained that George Eliot's excursions into the area of the novel, especially of those written by Scott, transformed her universe, showing her the possibility of good lives being lived outside of her own narrow sect. Fiction fashioned the "sea-change" that gave *The Mill on the Floss*, *Felix Holt*, and the rest of those famous narratives to English literature.

The young minister, in facing the area of general reading, will do well to investigate critical anthologies and appraisals. This will free him from the careless and indiscriminate contacts with books and authors so prevalent in this age of printer's ink. The five volumes, entitled *American Literature, a Period Anthology*, ought to be valuable, especially the last volume, published under the name of *Contemporary Trends*. The editors of "The Saturday Review of Literature" have issued an anthology with the up-to-date title, *Designed for Reading*. In books such as these the serious reader cannot help but discover veins of gold which he, on his own account, and without a guide, will wish to trace further and from which he may carry away homiletic treasure hidden from the casual observer of the literary landscape. In his own mind and heart will be created "the soil from which writing grows—a soil of the mind enriched by observation, experience, and abstract knowledge, rendered fertile by cultivation, and subject to a will to work it," as Henry Seidel Canby so well states it.

Two critical anthologies in the realm of poetry that will repay careful study are *Modern American Poetry*, by Louis Untermeyer, fourth revised edition, and *Poetry, Its Appreciation and Enjoyment*, by Louis Untermeyer and Carter Davidson. The second is divided into two so-called books, the one dealing with the experience and enjoyment of poetry and the other with its structure and technique. The entire area of poetical production in the English language is covered for illustrative material and no one can move through the more than five hundred pages of this useful volume without being brought into a really intelligent attitude toward poetry. The first anthology deals with the poetic impulse in America as expressed in the work of this country's writers, from Emily Dickinson to Nathalia Crane. Mr.

Untermeyer, in his somewhat lengthy preface, gives a survey of the poetry produced in this country from the end of the Civil War to the present. This is a piece of serious and illuminating writing. Then, in connection with the verse of each writer, is given a sketch covering the life of the poet, his education, his activities perhaps in other fields, and the impressions made by him upon his contemporaries. The editor of the anthology looks upon the artist as a person and the poetry as life expression, "native endowment, experience, perceptions of the world about him, human relations, thoughts about men and things." Professor Robert Morse Lovett, writing on "The Study of Literature" in *Roads to Knowledge*, edited by President W. A. Neilson, calls this the biographical, or personal approach.

This avenue to the study of poetry ought to be important for the minister. His sermons must not be aloof from the life of the people who look to him for inspiration and for guidance in the problems they must face from week to week. Many pulpiteers apparently feel that the best method of doing this is to decorate their sermons by doggerel drawn from the columns of the daily newspaper. Others habitually make use of verse that is in all conscience close enough to human experience but which can scarcely be called authentic poetry. Even ministers with college and seminary training acquire the easy habit of getting sermonic metrical illustration where this country gets its automobiles. Only serious study of worth-while productions and an intimate acquaintance with the challenging and cultivated voices of both present and past will mend this habit and lift pulpit utterance in this country to loftier levels. I recall a preacher who invariably tied a metrical tag to the end of each paragraph in his sermons. Sunday by Sunday this continued. Lively rhymes were lifted from every kind of printed page. Apparently no section of the sermon could be concluded without its sprig of verse. For many in the congregation this homiletic habit went far toward destroying the effect of what otherwise might have been helpful messages. On the other hand, there are preachers who seem to have the instinct for the apt quotation and the inevitable phrase. Inquiry will almost always uncover the fact that serious and critical study of poetry has awakened or has strengthened this instinct. The minister who cannot distinguish between a poetaster and a poet may himself become a pest. The preacher who has learned to pick out the wells of English undefiled will always delight and instruct and inspire.

The editors of *Poetry* have one chapter, altogether too brief, devoted

to a discussion of the critical sense which is able to distinguish good and bad poetry. It is pointed out that good taste may be developed and that it involves "open-mindedness, mental balance, common sense," and that it passes judgment upon what a poem actually is rather than in the light of what others say it is. At the end of the discussion place is found for four groups, each containing three poems, a genuine passage and two garbled versions. These are not ear-marked and the student is asked to separate the true from the false, a bona fide exercise in independent criticism. If the preacher gives himself to some such close and critical examination of the literature—prose, or verse—which comes within his ken, he will move out into a freedom in the appreciation and the enjoyment of the best in poetry that is bound to be reflected in his sermons. He will learn the witchery of words. Poetry will not be for him, as it is for some, merely "an irrelevant solace at leisure," but it will be a medium by which his mind and heart come to grips with life in vibrant and meaningful expression. It will be "imagination speculating upon the significance of experience." "Poetry," wrote Matthew Arnold, "is a criticism of life." This means that it looks below the surface into the inner values of experience. W. B. Yeats, according to Dean Inge, has "boldly said that 'whatever of philosophy has been made poetry is alone permanent.'" Inge goes on to assert that Plato as a systematic philosopher would have perished long ago had it not been for the fact that Plato was also "an inspired prose poet or prophet." This is what a recent critic has in the back of his mind when, while reviewing an English anthology, entitled *Recent Poetry*, he makes this appeal: "Will Mr. Yeats not better the conditions and help our civilization, which despite its material successes, has fallen into a slough of muddlement, to get out of it, by reminding us in ringing syllables of the duties of humanity to itself in a world over which too often the stars are clouded by the smoke of factories and there are still our slums wherein no flower of hope could grow?" Such reading and reflection will let the minister into the secret hinted at by Santayana in his serene sonnet.

"O world, thou choosest not the better part!  
It is not wisdom only to be wise,  
And on the inward vision close the eyes,  
But it is wisdom to believe the heart.  
Columbus found a world, and had no chart,  
Save one that faith deciphered in the skies;  
To trust the soul's invincible surmise  
Was all his science and his only art.

## RELIGION IN LIFE

Our knowledge is a torch of smoky pine  
That lights the pathway but one step ahead  
Across a void of mystery and dread.  
Bid, then, the tender light of faith to shine  
By which alone the mortal heart is led  
Into the thinking of the thought divine."

Current fiction and poetry may, of course, be so patronized by the minister in his general reading as to bring about a loss of perspective in his view of life. What John Erskine calls "the cult of the contemporary," may become a curse for the homilist. He quotes as a text for the followers of this cult the Prince of Denmark's famous dictum: "The end of playing, both at the first and now, was and is, to show the very age and body of the time, his form and presence." But Mr. Erskine proves that Shakespeare himself did not follow this prescription. "At least, he made some pretence to show his Elizabethan audience the form and presence of remote times and faraway places." Walt Whitman was of the opinion that "the proof of a poet shall be sternly deferred till his country absorbs him as affectionately as he absorbs it." But his poetry displays a love of his land "under an eternal form" and "even his beloved ferry-boats are dateless." This critic is certain that the study of fiction because it is contemporary rather than because it is good is "to find ourselves in the end just where we were in the beginning, with our prejudices more firmly rooted and our skin a bit thicker to any joy or sorrow in the world not our own." In *Backgrounds of Book Reviewing*, edited by the late Professor H. S. Mallory of Ann Arbor, with a revised edition issued in 1931, Theodore Roosevelt writes in his own emphatic way concerning current literature. He believes each reader must settle for himself the dividing line between "(1) not knowing anything about current books, and (2) swamping one's soul in the sea of vapiditv which overwhelms him who reads ONLY 'the last new books.'" His personal feeling is that so-called "books of the week" as employed by some reviewers "comprehensively damns both the books themselves and the reviewer who is willing to notice them. I would," he adds, "much rather see the heading 'books of the year before last.'"

The general reading of the minister will be prevented from being restricted by the fetish of contemporaneity if he find time for companionship with the essayist and the biographer. Both of these artists will enrich his reading with colors through which he will view his own day in better perspective. Especially is this true of the essay and in this area of literature

the maker of sermons can obtain appreciations and skills that ought to serve him well in his own work. The essay indeed to be successful must have the attribute which the sermonizer is seeking: it must be brief; it must be intimate; it must give glimpses of experience in which the commonplace and the transitory are caught up into eternal connotation and significance. In this field, too, are craftsmen working to-day who are worthy of all the high traditions of the essay which Montaigne and Lamb and Addison and Steele created and sustained. I can think of not a few ministers whose pulpit workmanship would be improved by a familiarity with Max Beerbohm and Christopher Morley and J. B. Priestley and Stephen Leacock and Hilaire Belloc, to name but a few of the essayists who in current literature hold important places as master-craftsmen. It has been observed that "since the turn of the century" the essay "has shown a tendency to adapt itself to contemporary taste." So radical has been this tendency that many essays are practical rather than cultural and the minister will have to make his own choice. In spite of this it will be found that the cultural essay is in line with the richest heritage which the past has bequeathed in the portrayal of personality. Modern psychology has contributed greatly to the essay, and nuances of suggestion in the delineation of character are possible to the writer of to-day that were undreamt of by Francis Bacon or even by Ralph Waldo Emerson.

The essay will furnish the preacher with words and phrases that lie close to reality itself. Of course poetry is the inexhaustible treasure-house of "words that laugh and cry." Writes T. S. Eliot, "The poetry of a people takes its life from the people's speech and in turn gives life to it, and represents its highest point of consciousness, its greatest power, and its most delicate sensibility." Yet, in my opinion, the prose of the essay crowds close upon metrical and rhythmic expression in this interchange of vitality. Verbal magic in the essay is not an intrusion; rather is it a natural part of the essay's power. Close and appreciative knowledge of this form of literature will help make perfect the minister's language, which, it must be confessed, is the most significant and most frequently used medium by which his message reaches the heart of humanity.

## Name Your Favorite Hymn

STANLEY ARMSTRONG HUNTER

**A**SAN FRANCISCO preacher who used as his evening topic "The second most popular book in the world," surprised most of his hearers when he said that the statistics of book sales placed the hymnal next to the Bible in popularity. In the light of that statement, though in some instances childhood associations, and possibly the tune, influenced the choice, the replies to the question, "What is your favorite hymn?" afford material for interesting study, and reveal the wealth of spiritual experience embodied in the pages of the hymnal.

There were those who found it difficult to designate a particular hymn, as they had favorites for varying moods and circumstances. John R. Mott, an hour before sailing for Japan, wrote his name in my hymnal under "Lead on, O King Eternal." But he was careful to say that it was "among" his favorites, rather than that it *was* his favorite. Professor D. C. Macintosh of Yale Divinity School replied: "My favorite hymns are many." S. Parkes Cadman named "The God of Abraham, praise" and "Thou hidden love of God." Allan Knight Chalmers of New York named "Breathe on me, breath of God" as the first in his list of three favorites, the others being "Where cross the crowded ways of life" and "March on, my soul, with strength"; while John W. Langdale chose "Thou hidden Source of calm repose," "Now thank we all our God" and "Spirit of God, descend upon my heart."

Though different hymns have been named as the favorite of President Franklin D. Roosevelt, "Art thou weary, art thou languid?" was the hymn designated by his secretary, in reply to my inquiry, as the President's favorite. This was the day after the defeat on the question of the World Court, but that probably had nothing to do with his choice. Under Kipling's Recessional, "God of our fathers, known of old," ex-President and Mrs. Herbert Hoover wrote their names.

"Dear Lord and Father of mankind," by Whittier, received the highest returns in the questionnaire. It is strange that the ending of a poem on "The Brewing of Soma," a study of early religious practices in India, by an American Quaker, should be found to express best our own needs to-

day! Those favoring it are Sherwood Eddy and William Pierson Merrill of New York, Howard Thurman of Howard University, Michi Kawai of Tokyo, T. Z. Koo of Shanghai, Muriel Lester of London, Frederick J. Libby of Washington, Kenneth D. Miller of Madison, New Jersey, Chaplain D. Charles Gardner of Stanford University, Alfred S. Nickless of San Francisco, President James A. Kelso of Pittsburgh, Kenneth L. Parker of Allahabad, India, Edgar A. Lowther of San Francisco, Oliver Hart Bronson of Santa Barbara, Ray Newton, Joseph B. C. Mackie, and Alexander McColl of Philadelphia.

The hymn that stands next to it in popularity, according to my tabulation, is "O Love that wilt not let me go," by George Matheson, the Scotch Presbyterian. Those who chose this hymn were Robert Freeman of Pasadena, Mrs. John R. Mott of Montclair, Frank Fitt of Grosse Pointe Farms, Oswald W. S. McCall and Mrs. H. F. Swartz of Berkeley, Christian F. Reisner and E. Graham Wilson of New York, McIllyar H. Lichliter of Columbus, Jerome Davis of Yale Divinity School, Clovis G. Chappell of Birmingham, David E. Culley of Western Theological Seminary, President William H. Oxtoby of San Anselmo, J. Wilmar Gresham of San Francisco, J. A. MacCallum and Mrs. W. C. Covert of Philadelphia, and Lucius H. Bugbee of Cincinnati, with "Dear Lord and Father of mankind" as his second choice.

"O Master, let me walk with Thee," the hymn of Washington Gladden, stands third in the formal vote. It was designated as a favorite by Bernard C. Clausen of Pittsburgh, James E. Clark of Nashville, C. Franklin Ward of Rochester, Carl S. Patton and Arthur Casady of the Pacific School of Religion, Wesley Gordon Nicholson and Glenn W. Moore of Los Angeles, Miss Marcia Kerr and Weston T. Johnson of San Francisco, H. B. McAuley of Orange, Otis Linn of Walnut Creek, R. O. Williams of Oakland, and Bishop Charles K. Gilbert, of New York.

"Where cross the crowded ways of life," by the Methodist missionary-statesman, Frank Mason North (who wrote that his own choice is "Jesus, Thou Joy of loving hearts"), is preferred by Alva W. Taylor of Nashville, W. Paul Reagor of Oakland, Paul S. Leinbach of Philadelphia, Ralph W. Sockman, Franklin Mack, Mrs. John McDowell and William F. Klein of New York, Carl Knudsen of Plymouth, Massachusetts, Lynn T. White of San Anselmo and A. H. Saunders of San Francisco. Ernest F. Tittle of Evanston coupled with it "O God, our help in ages past."

"When I survey the wondrous cross" is the selection of Ezra Allen Van Nuys of San Francisco, George N. Lucock of Wooster, W. H. Lyon of India, Thomas C. Pears, Jr., of Philadelphia, Ralph McAfee of Detroit, Frank W. Bible and Harrison Ray Anderson of Chicago, Stewart P. MacLennan of Hollywood, J. W. G. Ward of Oak Park, John Timothy Stone and Andrew C. Zenos of the Presbyterian Theological Seminary, William Adams Brown and Frederick K. Stamm of New York.

"Spirit of God, descend upon my heart" is the favorite of Gaius Glenn Atkins of Auburn Theological Seminary, Lawrence Wilson of Sacramento, Ruth Isabel Seabury of Boston, J. Ross Stevenson of Princeton Theological Seminary, Herman N. Morse of New York City, Gurdon C. Oxtoby of San Anselmo, and Herbert H. Field of Brooklyn.

"Lead, kindly light" was chosen by William Lyon Phelps of Yale, Roger Babson of Wellesley Hills, Mrs. F. S. Bennett, Mrs. Katherine V. Silverthorn and John H. Race of New York, Lieutenant Governor George R. Lunn of Albany, and Mrs. J. J. Banninga of India.

"O God, our help in ages past" was chosen by Bishop Edward L. Parsons of San Francisco, Dan B. Brummitt of Kansas City, Henry Pitt Van Dusen of Union Theological Seminary, John Howard Mellish, Alvin E. Magary, and George A. Clarke of Brooklyn.

"Immortal Love, forever full" was chosen by John Wright Buckingham of the Pacific School of Religion as well as by John Ray Ewers of Pittsburgh, George Stewart of Stamford, Henry B. Master of Philadelphia, and J. Frederic Berg of Brooklyn.

"A mighty fortress is our God" was chosen by Ewart E. Turner of Berlin, Miss Mary Amelia Steer of Philadelphia, Kenneth Feaver of Alameda, Mrs. Gurdon C. Oxtoby of San Anselmo and Wallace H. Finch of Baldwin, N. Y.

"The sands of time are sinking" was selected by Sam Higginbottom of India, Howard I. Kerr of Nashville, Clarence B. Allen of Pittsburgh and Mrs. Robert E. Speer of New York.

"Fairest Lord Jesus" was designated by Frank D. Betty of Philadelphia, Hugh T. Kerr of Pittsburgh, Mrs. Wilbur Lyon of India and Miss Mary E. Hunter of Africa.

"How firm a foundation" was the choice of James I. Vance of Nashville, C. T. Holman of Chicago and Elliott Field of New York.

Three votes were also given these hymns:

"Jesus, the very thought of Thee," Merton S. Rice, Detroit; Charles R. Erdman, of Princeton; John McDowell, New York.

"My faith looks up to Thee," J. A. Stevenson, Philadelphia; Elizabeth Farra, M.D., Amballa, India; Silas F. Johnson, M.D., Elat, Africa.

"O Jesus, I have promised," Harry Hopkins Hubbell, Cleveland; William N. Case, Reno; Miss Julia Fraser, Oakland.

"Faith of our fathers, living still," Guy W. Wadsworth, Los Angeles; George W. Thorn, M.D., Elat, Africa; Jay T. Stocking, St. Louis.

The hymns having two choices were:

"The day Thou gavest, Lord, is ended," Robert E. Speer, New York; Mrs. D. Emmett Alter, Abbottabad, India.

"Praise to the Holiest in the height," J. E. Wishart, San Francisco Theological Seminary; Lynn Harold Hough, Drew University, the latter giving "My God, I thank Thee who hast made," as his second choice.

The hymns receiving one choice are:

"Abide with me," Robert Rogers, Brooklyn.

"All hail the power of Jesus' Name," Jason Noble Pierce, San Francisco.

"All people that on earth do dwell," D. Emmett Alter, Abbottabad, India.

"Awake, my soul, stretch every nerve," Ilion T. Jones, Iowa City.

"Behold, a sower from afar," W. B. Thorp, Palo Alto.

"Beneath the cross of Jesus," Cleland B. McAfee, New York.

"Break Thou the bread of life," Newell J. Elliott, Los Angeles.

"Come, Thou fount of every blessing," Henry M. Edmonds, Birmingham.

"Day is dying in the west," Henry Smith Leiper, New York.

"Go, labor on, spend and be spent," Ralph Cooper Hutchinson, Washington and Jefferson College.

"God of our fathers, whose almighty hand," A. J. McCartney, Washington.

"God the Lord a King remaineth," J. Stanley Durkee, Brooklyn.

"Hark! hark, my soul!" Miss Gertrude Schultz, New York.

"I know that my Redeemer lives," A. P. Higley, Cleveland.

"I sought the Lord, and afterward I knew," Calvin W. Laufer, Philadelphia.

"In the cross of Christ I glory," J. J. Banninga, Madura, India.

"Jerusalem the golden," Henry Barraclough, Philadelphia.

"Jesus calls us o'er the tumult," James H. Nicol, Beirut, Syria.

"Jesus, keep me near the cross," Toyohiko Kagawa, Tokyo, Japan.

"Jesus, Thou joy of loving hearts," Joseph R. Sizoo, Washington.

"Jesus, Thy boundless love to me," Raymond T. Walker, Harrisburg.

"Joy to the world, the Lord is come," Mrs. Carl S. Patton, Berkeley.

"Just as I am, without one plea," D. D. Burrell, Williamsport.

"Lord of all being, throned afar," Robert Elliott Brown, Oberlin Theological Seminary.

"Lord of our life, and God of our salvation," Graham C. Hunter, Fullerton, California.

"Lord, speak to me that I may speak," Russell Henry Stafford, Boston.

"Majestic sweetness sits enthroned," Bishop Edwin Holt Hughes, Washington.

"No, not despairingly," Henry Seymour Brown, Chicago.

"O beautiful for spacious skies," President H. F. Swartz, Pacific School of Religion.

"O God, beneath Thy guiding hand," Gerritt Verkuyl, Philadelphia.

"O God of Bethel, by whose hand," Donald Mackenzie, Princeton Theological Seminary.

"O God of earth and altar," John Haynes Holmes, New York.

"O Thou great friend to all the sons of men," Russell J. Clinchy, Washington.

"O worship the King, all glorious above," George W. Richards, Lancaster.

"Rise up, O men of God," Walter John Sherman, Oakland.

"The King of Love my Shepherd is," H. A. Lichtwardt, Hamadan, Persia.

"The Light of God is falling," Mrs. Cleland B. McAfee, New York.

"The Lord's my Shepherd, I'll not want," Andrew Mutch, Bryn Mawr.

"There is a green hill far away," S. M. Zwemer, Princeton Theological Seminary.

"This is my Father's world," W. C. Covert, Philadelphia.

"This is the day the Lord hath made," S. W. McKelvey, Kansas City.

"We may not climb the heavenly steeps," James R. Joy, New York.

In the face of this array of varying choices, what can one at the receiving end of the questionnaire do about his own favorite? The only thing, of course, is to name it.

I still think that the best hymn in the modern hymn book is Henry van Dyke's "Joyful, joyful we adore Thee."

I  
rece  
He  
Bult  
bein  
olog  
noth  
more  
his  
engag  
radi  
princ  
latte  
theo

ident  
acqua  
while  
also  
agreed  
man  
radic

Barth  
have  
scienc  
The

\* J.  
Erminie

# Bultmann as a Barthian

A Review of *Jesus and the Word*<sup>1</sup>

GILBERT T. ROWE

In the preface to the third edition of his commentary on *The Epistle to the Romans*, Karl Barth remarks: "The strangest episode in the history of the book since the appearance of the second edition has been its friendly reception by Bultmann and its equally friendly rejection by Schlatter." He concludes that the approval of so radical a New Testament critic as Bultmann is sufficient to offset "the original outcry against the book as being an incitement to a Diocletian persecution of historical, critical theology." In the preface to the second edition Barth had written: "I have nothing whatever to say against historical criticism. I recognize it, and once more state quite definitely that it is both necessary and justified." In his reference to Bultmann's commendation he says: "I do not wish to engage in a controversy with Bultmann as to which of us is the more radical." It is clear, however, from the writings of these two theologians, principally Barth's *Romans* and Bultmann's *Jesus and the Word*, that the latter is far more radical than the former in both Biblical criticism and theology.

If Barth was agreeably surprised to find Bultmann willing to become identified with the Barthian movement in theology, both Barth and others acquainted with Bultmann's work in the New Testament field knew that while there was agreement in general purpose and tendency there were also points of difference and sharp disagreements as well. While both agree in calling themselves "crisis theologians" in that each regards every man as standing in a perilous position and under the necessity of making a radical decision, from that point their paths begin immediately to diverge.

Among the leading theologians who have allied themselves with Barth, Bultmann stands closest to those modern Christian scholars who have endeavored to cope with the difficulties thrust upon theology by science, Biblical criticism, historical discovery, and modern philosophy. The translators indicate in the preface the main difference through the

<sup>1</sup> *Jesus and the Word*. By Rudolf [Karl] Bultmann. Translated by Louise Pettibone Smith and Erminie Huntress. New York: Charles Scribner's Sons. \$2.

statement that, "Professor Bultmann's special approach to his subject and the nature of the book combine to give it a less theoretical character than the other writings emanating from this group." The bane of theology from the time when Christian thinkers first began to put their beliefs into systematic form until the present hour has been the intermixture of purely speculative elements which could not be supported by facts or experience, and yet which were declared to be necessary as objects of Christian faith and essential to salvation. It was this incorrigible tendency toward speculation on the part of theologians that brought the science of theology into disrepute and deprived it of standing and recognition among the sciences. In recent years, however, the speculative method has been replaced by the scientific method, and theology has been slowly regaining its place.

The leading exponents of the Barthian theology are Barth and Emil Brunner. While Barth has shocked the religious world into seriousness of mind as no other person has for a century and done more than any other recent thinker to bring home to men a sense of the omnipotence of God, he has involved his religion and theology with ancient philosophy to such an extent that many of his readers have been in doubt whether he was a Christian theologian or a Gnostic or Manichæan. Brunner, while more systematic and balanced than Barth and clearer in his statements, goes back to the ancient councils and still further back to Irenæus, and undertakes to interpret the person and work of Jesus Christ in terms which declare in words that Jesus was a real man and at the same time clothe him with a human nature such as no other man has ever possessed. After following Barth through *Romans* with his absolute contrasts between God and man and between eternity and time, his "impossible possibilities" and "possible impossibilities," and his multiplied and startling paradoxes, and after laboring with Brunner through *The Mediator* and seeing him endeavor to present Jesus Christ in terms of an ancient and outlived philosophy, it is a relief to turn to Bultmann and follow him as he undertakes to recover the gospel as it was actually presented in the New Testament, and to ascertain wherein the permanent pertinence of that gospel lies.

Bultmann disowns the method of the rationalistic theologians, with their general notions of "universal depravity," "divine nature," and "human nature," and turns to history as a man who is involved in it and not merely as a spectator to ascertain what meaning events have for him and what demands they lay upon him. In keeping with this attitude toward history,

he approaches Jesus with one great object in view. "Attention is entirely limited to what he *purposed*, and hence to what in his purpose as a part of history makes a present demand upon us." Through the use of "form criticism," a method by which the sayings attributed to Jesus are sifted, he reaches unnecessarily radical conclusions concerning both the utterances and acts of Jesus. How far the early Christian community preserved the actual words of Jesus and an objectively true picture of his person it is extremely difficult to determine, and this difficulty would be depressing if not destructive for those whose interest is in the personality of Jesus. But for those who find in the New Testament message an actual encounter with reality the effect is just the same whether the word comes from Jesus or some other person. "By the tradition Jesus is named as bearer of the message; according to overwhelming probability he really was. Should it prove otherwise, that does not change in any way what is said in the record." The reader of the New Testament is faced with a demand that he respond to the call of God. "Since the investigation really concerns the content, meaning, and validity for us of what is taught in the gospels, the question of how much the historical Jesus and how much other people have contributed to that content is of secondary importance."

The ministry of Jesus had behind it the law and the promise of the Jewish people, and that law which demanded obedience had only one meaning, "to release man from the world, to separate him from any interest in an independent cultural development and to humble him in obedience to the transcendent power of God." The promise kept hope alive, and the Jewish people at the time of the coming of Jesus were most strongly stirred by Messianic hopes. One Messianic movement after another arose only to be crushed out by the powerful arm of Rome. "All these Messianic insurrections the Romans suppressed, and crucified their instigators or executed them in other ways whenever they could get their hands on them." Some of these movements had no political character, but the Romans could not draw nice distinctions and all such movements were suspected as hostile to the Roman authority. The movements of John and of Jesus were Messianic, and "there can be no doubt that Jesus like other agitators died on the cross as a Messianic prophet." The message of Jesus, therefore, is an *eschatological gospel*. It is "based on the certainty: *the Kingdom of God is beginning, is beginning now!*" "In this last hour, the hour of decision, Jesus is sent with the final, decisive word." This call to decision is the

call to repentance. "But most men cling to this world and do not muster energy to decide wholly for God." While they desire the Kingdom, they desire it along with other things—riches, the respect of other men, and the comforts of life. The Kingdom is something absolutely miraculous, "opposed to all the here and now." It tears men up by the roots from their business life and their social interests and demands that the dead bury their dead. But while Jesus proclaims the nearness of a wholly supernatural kingdom, he "rejects the whole content of apocalyptic speculation." He does not calculate the time or picture the glories of the coming kingdom.

Bultmann shares with Barth and his school and with Luther and Calvin their strong antipathy toward humanism. The law and unconditional obedience, and not the fact that they were by nature God's children, made the Jewish nation a *chosen* people, and man as such has as little claim as the Jew. Man as such is not designed for the kingdom. Though he bear the image of the earthly, he may never bear the image of the heavenly. "The Kingdom is an eschatological miracle, and those destined for it are not thus destined because of their humanity, but because they are called by God." "Not the individual but the 'church' is called, to it belongs the promise." Bultmann leans toward the predestination of the Calvinistic wing of the Reformation, though he and the other Barthians refrain from declaring their belief in the "horrible decree" of election to damnation. "Further, the call to repentance guards against the misunderstanding that a man either could depend upon his calling or ought ever to despair of his calling. Through the call to repentance he is forced to decision, and his decision will show whether he belongs to the chosen or to the rejected." Here the author reveals his Calvinistic background, holding with Calvin that faith is evidence of election rather than with Luther that faith is the means of salvation or the act of receiving the grace offered in Jesus Christ. Man is not to be thought of as possessed of a good side and a bad side, of a lower nature and a higher nature. "It is not the physical in man which is evil in him—the *whole* man is evil if his will is evil." A man is good when he is obedient to God; he is bad when he ignores or rejects God. There is, however, in Bultmann nothing of the "double predestination" so prominent in Barth and Brunner, a predestination through which all men are condemned to eternal damnation by virtue of their creatureliness and sinfulness and called to eternal salvation because of the grace of God revealed and made effective through Jesus Christ.

Bultmann views the Kingdom of God as entirely future, as the future action of God, and as God's future, and therefore as something which the action of man is powerless to affect. But the Kingdom wholly determines the present because it now compels man to decision, and just this necessity of decision constitutes the essential part of his human existence. "If men are standing in the crisis of decision, and if precisely this crisis is the essential characteristic of their humanity, then every hour is the last hour, and we can understand that for Jesus the whole contemporary mythology is pressed into the service of this conception of human existence. Thus he understood and proclaimed his hour as the last hour." This conception of the Kingdom of God Bultmann regards as absolutely alien to the present-day conception of Christianity, which thinks of each man as endowed with definite capacities to be developed according to an ideal. The modern conception assumes the intrinsic worth of humanity and regards it in at least its highest and noblest features as divine, but the worth of a man for Jesus is determined simply by the decision the man makes in the here-and-now of his present life. Because of the coming of the kingdom each man is confronted by the command to act in accordance with the will of God.

The core of the message of Jesus was that each man must obey the will of God. Jewish ethics laid upon man the same demand, but the difference is "that Jesus has conceived radically the idea of obedience." Therefore there can be no external and formal authority. What God's will is, is not stated by an external authority, so that the content of the command might be a matter of indifference, but man is trusted and expected to see for himself what God commands. "So long as obedience is only subjection to an authority which man does not understand, it is no true obedience; something in man still remains outside and does not submit, is not bound by the command of God. Criticism can still arise: *in itself* this does not concern me, *in itself* these things are indifferent—but I choose to obey. In *this* kind of decision a man stands outside of his action, he is not completely obedient. Radical obedience exists only when a man inwardly assents to what is required of him, when the thing commanded is seen as intrinsically God's command." The demands of God are not mediated to man through Scripture as a formal authority, neither are they derived from an ideal picture of humanity. "They arise quite simply from the crisis of decision in which man stands before God." Each man in this crisis

of decision knows what is *now* good and evil, and he knows this directly from the immediate situation. "How each individual must decide, he will know, if he seeks not his own interests but the will of God."

In the teaching of Jesus God is conceived as both remote and near. This view is different from that of the Greeks, on the one hand, which regarded God as a part of the world or as identical with the world and thus destroyed the remoteness or transcendence of God, and from that of the Jews, on the other, which tended more and more to think of God as absent from the world. "The whole course of time is divided into two epochs: the present age (to which past and present belong) and the future age in which the glory of God will appear. The more sharply this contrast is conceived, and the more gloriously the future gleams, as the time when all powers hostile to God are annihilated, so much the more does the present appear as forsaken by God, as the time when Satan and his evil spirits work their will." This Jewish notion endangers the whole idea of God, which loses its meaning if God the Creator and Absolute Power is not thought of as determining man in his present existence. So long as God remains absent for some unaccountable reason and leaves the world at the mercy of evil powers, a man may easily lose the consciousness of standing before God in the decisive "now," and become fearful of the day when he *will* stand before God. Thus a man may think of the action of the present moment as insignificant and unreal and look forward to the awful time when he will stand face to face with God. But "the distant God is at the same time *the God near at hand*, whose reality is not grasped when a man seeks to escape from his own concrete existence, but precisely when he holds it fast." The essence of each man's life consists in the full freedom of decision, and through obedience each can win fellowship with God. "If a man must say that he cannot find God in the reality of his own present life, and if he would compensate for this by the thought that God is nevertheless the final cause of all that happens, then his belief in God will be a theoretical speculation or a dogma, and however great the force with which he clings to this belief, it will not be true faith, for faith can be only the recognition of the activity of God in his own life."

In accordance with his rejection of universal truths knowable through reason, Bultmann repudiates the idea of man's sonship to God as a natural endowment. Man is not by nature a son of God, but he can become a son in obedience to God, through God's delivering act. The possibility of such

sonship, however, exists for all men, for God is seeking man and imposing upon him his claim, and when a man responds and acknowledges God's right to possess him, the God hitherto remote is found to be near. Only those who become new men as through forgiveness they are reborn to obedience and become conscious of God's will in their own lives can be regarded as children of God. It is through a radical act of obedience and not through any process of development that sonship is to be realized. "Humanism knows merely the development of humanity with its possibilities and different stages; here the true man is the ideal self, which is beyond his concrete empirical existence, and because of which no man can be wholly lost."

Contrary to all humanistic notions of man's native worth and self-development is the gospel of God, which confronts each man in Jesus as the word of God, and demands instantaneous response by that repentance which acknowledges God's right of possession and wholly surrenders to God's claim. Jesus is the bearer of the word and in the word assures man of the forgiveness of God. But there must be no trifling. "Now is the accepted time." The past is gone beyond recall, and the future is not yet. The word of God presses upon each man at the present moment, and for all he may know, his decision is final. He has no right to presume upon God's mercy or to think that another opportunity may be given. Here and now each man must make the final decision to accept or reject God's will.

Thus Bultmann closes his arresting consideration of Jesus as the Word of God. No difficult historical questions are allowed to becloud the issue; no abstruse metaphysical problems obtrude to make possible the notion that salvation is a matter of assent to creed. Each man finds himself in the valley of decision, and upon his choice hangs the issue of life and death. "Therefore the attestation of the truth of the word lies wholly in what takes place between word and hearer. This can be called subjective only by him who either has not understood or has not taken seriously the meaning of 'word.' Whoever understands it and takes it seriously knows that there is no other possibility of God's forgiveness becoming real for man than the word. In the word and not otherwise does Jesus bring forgiveness. Whether his word is truth, whether he is sent from God—that is the decision to which the hearer is constrained, and the word of Jesus remains: 'Blessed is he who finds no cause of offense in me.'"

Bultmann, Barth, Brunner, and others of that school have brought

an arresting influence into religion and a corrective to theology, though Bultmann exaggerates the exercise of the will almost to the point of destroying reflective thought and æsthetic appreciation, and Barth and Brunner emphasize the omnipotence of God and reality of eternity very near to the utter destruction of man and the meaninglessness of time. These men have compelled the religious world to take account of the coming end of all things earthly—the grim, ghastly, disagreeable fact of death, something that æsthetic natures like Goethe and humanists generally refuse to do. They remind the church that this transient world cannot be the true place or state of man's final destiny and that the religious life will have its pilgrim aspect to the world's end. And yet there is something wrong with Barth's thesis: "Vain are the works of man," for to deny that man has a part in salvation and world betterment is to throw all blame on God for the sin, guilt, grief and deviltry of the world, for all the war, pestilence, famine, cruelty, and injustice of past, present, and future times and to wait in dumb and impotent acquiescence until God may see fit to bring in the Kingdom or bring the world to an end. This world is where people now are, and they who would serve God and eternity can do it only by helping to produce better people and trying to make this world a better world. Humanism came as a corrective of Reformation theology and Barthianism now arises as a corrective of humanism. The way out, however, does not lie in the direction of a return to Calvin and Luther or in humanism's gospel of man as his own saviour, but on into a future which must produce a better church and formulate a better theology than the world has ever yet had.

## Book Reviews

**The Church and Society.** By F. ERNEST JOHNSON. New York: The Abingdon Press. \$1.50.

IN the two hundred odd pages of this stimulating book, Doctor Johnson has performed a much-needed service. There is perhaps no field in our contemporary thinking where clarification is so much needed as in that of the church's social mission, and there are few persons better qualified by experience and training to supply the light that is needed.

The book, the author tells us, "represents an effort to crystallize the results of some years of experience and thought in the area of institutional relationships and functions." Its "aim has been to present the elements of a social philosophy for organized Christianity, with particular reference to the most important fields of application."

The position to which the author comes is, briefly stated, the following: That the contrast frequently made between the individual and the social gospel is without justification in theory; that the gospel has been from its inception both individual and social, and that any attempt to preach a social gospel which is not accompanied by willingness to accept the consequences of that gospel in personal discipline is futile and will prove in the end disastrous.

There is, to be sure, nothing novel in this. What is new is the conclusion which the author draws and the illuminating way in which it is illustrated by reference to the contemporary situation. Central for the author's thesis is the distinction between two ways of conceiving the function of the church: the way of the sect, and the way of the church. Ac-

cording to the first, the function of the church is to assemble a company of saints who agree to accept the standards and discipline the church sets up, and whose way of life therefore stands in sharp contrast with that of the community at large. According to the second, the church is the community at worship. It must therefore include persons of different degrees of moral and intellectual proficiency and in the interest of comprehensiveness must abandon the rigorous discipline upon which the sect insists. This distinction, first clearly formulated by Troeltsch, the Roman Catholic Church recognizes and accepts, but it meets the difficulty of making a place for the sect within the church through the provision in the religious orders for a type of life more rigorous than that demanded of other professing Christians. This is the root of that church's acceptance of the double standard, so vehemently condemned by Protestants.

Protestantism, too, faces the same difficulty, but it has as yet found no adequate way to deal with it. With the rejection of the double standard, only two solutions remain for Protestants. Either those who hold the more rigorous ideal will leave the great church and set up smaller bodies of their own, where theory and practice are more nearly in accord; or, remaining within the larger body, they will try to commit the church as a whole to their standards, in spite of the fact that the majority are not prepared to accept them. This procedure, when successful, gives to many of the social pronouncements of the Protestant churches an air of unreality. They are fine words, to which the practice of the church as a

whole gives the lie. What is needed, Doctor Johnson believes, is some theoretical recognition in Protestantism of the double standard, which exists in fact, and such change in our ecclesiastical organization as will make place for the sect type within the church without the necessity of committing the whole church to doctrines and practices in which, however admirable in themselves, its members do not in fact as yet believe.

This is a book which for ripe wisdom and clarifying insight represents a distinct step forward in our thought about the contemporary church. It deserves study and restudy by all who are in a position of leadership and should lead all who love and believe in the church to serious searching of heart. As one whose thought has long been moving in the direction taken by Doctor Johnson, I for one wish to express to him my appreciation of the service he has rendered and to request for the book the wide reading and sympathetic consideration it deserves.

WILLIAM ADAMS BROWN.  
Union Theological Seminary.

**The Nature of Revelation.** By NATHAN SÖDERBLOM. Translated by FREDERIC E. PAMP. New York: Oxford University Press. \$2.00.

THE Archbishop of Upsala was an ecumenical figure in European Christianity during the first quarter of the present century, and it is helpful to have a translation of one of his important works available in English.

In these days of Barthian exaggerations, it is gratifying to read an author who takes divine revelation seriously without cutting it off from history. "No religion is a product of culture, all religion depends on revelation." But with equal emphasis he tells us that, "The man who says: 'God is revealed in Christ,' at

the same time says: 'God is revealed in Nature,'" and "cannot escape saying: 'God is revealed in history.'"

Fruitful insights into the religious import of personality abound. The author may truly be called a personalist. He offers a wise distinction between the mysticism of personality and the mysticism of infinity. While no attempt is made to present a solution of the problem of evil, the facile treatment of all evil as somehow the will of God is disposed of by quoting the answer of Robbert Robbertsz to the Calvinists. Robbertsz said that the woman in the garden blamed the serpent. "The serpent, who was young and dull, made no answer. Now he has become old and confident and comes to the Synod of Dort and says that God has done it." Söderblom recognizes that both man and God contend with a "Given." "There is something in that which happens both within and without the human world which drags down and hinders." "Revelation is a struggle against resisting forces."

This is a compact, suggestive, and profoundly Christian book.

EDGAR SHEFFIELD BRIGHTMAN.  
Boston University.

**The Younger Churchmen Look at the Church.** Edited by RALPH H. READ. New York: The Macmillan Company. \$2.50.

THIRTY-EIGHT years is the average age of the contributors to this volume. Fourteen of them are pastors representing a wide variety of churches; all of them by school training and by practical experience are qualified to write on the subject assigned to them.

The book has much to commend it. In the first place, it is a symposium which carries to the end a continuity of thought, indicating careful group planning and

avoiding thereby tiresome repetitions. Secondly, its purpose is avowedly constructive. These men believe in the church and are dead in earnest about its necessity for society. Their criticism of it is, therefore, friendly, appreciative and intended to strengthen rather than destroy. In the third place, a reading of the chapters will reveal that the word "younger" in the title refers to the youthful spirit of the writers, the spirit of aliveness and growth, and not to any immaturity of thought, for a high order of thinking and writing combine to make the book delightful to read and rewarding in the wealth of material which research and scholarship have combined to produce.

In reading the book one should bear in mind that it represents what one section of the younger churchmen are thinking, rather than a cross section of all the younger churchmen. Perhaps it is the larger section, but there is another younger group in Protestantism, more conservative and less insistent upon the social emphasis, who would no doubt commend the spirit, but not subscribe to all of the content and emphasis of the volume.

If one is looking for a clear and concise statement of this liberal social viewpoint, expressed with spiritual passion, on the relation of the church to the present social order, the state, war and peace, international relations, church union and co-operation, youth, labor movements, the individual, as well as the place of preaching and worship in the church of to-day, he will find it here.

For many it will prove completely satisfying in what they conceive the total message and mission of the church to be. For others it will not be so completely satisfying. The treatment is very much of this world, and, while I am sure each

of the writers would heartily endorse a treatment of the other worldly elements of the Christian message and the church's relation to those elements, they have been implied more often than expressed in the present work, on the ground, no doubt, that the immediate and pressing business has to do with life now. A volume is needed, however, from some one with the official viewpoint and scientific training on the relation of the eternalness of life to the individual and his social order amid the present world conditions.

Laymen should read this book. I suspect that it was written largely for them.

FRED P. CORSON.

President of Dickinson College.

**The Protestant Church as a Social Institution.** By H. PAUL DOUGLASS and EDMUND DE S. BRUNNER. New York: Harper & Brothers. \$2.50.

THE authors of this book served as project directors of the Institute of Social and Religious Research during its fourteen years' existence. The institute, applying the scientific method to socio-religious phenomena, conducted forty-eight research projects, publishing their findings in seventy-eight volumes. These studies constitute the main source material for this book. Here is assembled a wealth of facts, well-documented, valuably illustrated with charts and tables, and wisely interpreted.

We who have been so critical of institutionalism should ponder well the authors' conclusions. Recognizing the dangers inherent in its institutionalization, they maintain that if creative religion is to have permanence and power, institutionalism is not only inevitable but desirable. To think otherwise is to be "sociologically infantile." Also it

is manageable and can be controlled so as to give the maximum power to religious values.

A large section of the book deals with the institutional factors and processes within the church. Membership, organization, ministry, finances, educational and social programs are all put under the microscope, examined and evaluated. The minister who would like to see himself and his church viewed objectively should read this section.

An important section dealing with three external forces that condition its life, considers first the concrete social environment surrounding the local church, and controlling to a large extent its institutional destinies. Modern social changes are so many, so rapid and so great that an unprecedented strain is put upon the church. The fact that ours is an age dominated by integrative forces that make for co-operation among the churches is a second conditioning factor. When there is so much talk of church unity, coupled with many and varied attempts to realize that end, the authors' analyses and appraisal of these movements are valuable. Especially enlightening is chapter fifteen, with its charts and other materials showing maximum and minimum opposition and agreement among the various denominations, and the prospects of unity among them. The final conditioning factor is the church's intellectual and religious climate. The latter—"the way its constituents take their religion"—reflects the moral and intellectual currents of the age. According to the authors, the intellectual and religious climate of the church has changed more in some regions than others. It still, however, remains essentially conservative, no general revolution having as yet occurred. "Religion more than holds its own for religious people.

Quantitatively and qualitatively it is going ahead; with more frequency of progress on the side of interests and appreciations than on the side of external practices."

Throughout the book the authors emphasize two aspects of church life, the mundane and supra-mundane, the fact that the church is both a social institution and a spiritual enterprise. That people voluntarily support it, that its ministry is ever conscious of a divine mission, and that it insistently engages in "transactions which have no utilitarian value" are facts that exert a tremendous influence upon the church as a social institution. And yet it is a social institution, conditioned as such by its environment, and amenable within certain limits to rational control. A wise churchmanship will bring and keep these two characteristics together, planning policies so that the values of each will be expressed and conserved.

Recognizing that the church as a social institution has been poorly managed, that the realm in which wisely planned policies can operate is limited, the authors are nevertheless convinced that the church is a powerful social force, and can be made more so. Hence the book is in no sense either the report of a post-mortem examination, or of a consultation in extremis. It resembles more closely the diagnosis of a life extension staff, and reveals no reason why with proper care the church should not expect both a long and useful life.

EUGENE WILFORD SHRIGLEY.  
First Methodist Episcopal Church,  
Richmond Hill, New York.

**Russia's Iron Age.** By WILLIAM HENRY CHAMBERLIN. Boston: Little, Brown & Co. \$4.00.

CHAMBERLIN speaks with authority, and not as a week-end. He knows—

and he ought to know. A dozen years he has been in Russia, living there and traveling. Now he has left the country for good and he can speak his mind—and he does. Moreover, he has represented a paper that more nearly than most has a way of telling the truth, if and when the truth can be ascertained. Needless to say, that paper is *The Christian Science Monitor*.

Chamberlin is the author of another authoritative book, *Soviet Russia*. That book is more optimistic than this. Things have slipped in the last four years, and all things are now in the iron grip of rigid despotism. The Russia of 1930 is as black and despotic as that of 1730. The "liquidation" of the Kulaks has taken far more victims than any Czarist persecution. Gay-Pay-Oo sabotage charges are about as creditable as were ritual murder charges directed against the Jews. The irony of contemporary persecution is sharpened by the fact that many of its active agents are the very persons who suffered under the Czar, for political convictions.

Communism is described as "a faith without God," and many interesting parallels are drawn between Communist organization and ecclesiastical. Lenin is the saviour, Marx's *Kapital* the Bible; and there are schools of interpretation, though only one orthodoxy. Pilgrimages to saints' tombs have ceased, but there is one super-shrine, Lenin's mausoleum in the Red Square. The ikon has gone from the kitchen corner but portraits of The Leaders abound. Severe tests are applied on entrance to the Party, periodic purges take place, and confession in public under examining commissions often goes on. The class meeting has its counterpart. Public recantation is the only way back into Stalin's good graces. Zinoviev said in 1933: "My sin before the

Party is very great. I who could learn directly from Lenin, and after that from Stalin, went off the road and placed myself in the position of an apostate."

There are less than three millions in the Party, but they exercise absolute power over 160 millions. There are, however, four and a half million "Young Communists" (fourteen-twenty-three years) and six million "Pioneers." And the whole is kept true to type by education, expulsion, and persecution.

The drive for industrialization goes on ruthlessly and with some considerable success, though never up to the goals. "Sabotage by the class enemy" is the "all too easy and familiar explanation for the results of bureaucracy, technical incompetence, and over-ambitious planning." Young Communists furnish a drive of "disciplined enthusiasm," but great numbers of the workers must be driven to their tasks.

All in all, it is a dark picture that is painted. The few material accomplishments, though considerable in magnitude, are offset by the incontrovertible evidence that starvation and terror still stalk through parts of the land and are the studied weapon used by the powers that be, to destroy their detractors.

Chamberlin will show you the prisoners at work; he will tell you the real accomplishments of the "Plan" (or plans) in cold figures. You can see the tractors plowing—and the Kulaks dying. He discusses the possibilities of foreign war, and explains the Soviet foreign policy. You see Old Russia and the New if you go with him. He is fair and he is comprehensive. And when it is all summed up it is "government by propaganda" and "government by terror!"

There is a chapter on "Soviet Humor" and we must cite one example. A host of rabbits from all parts of the Soviet

appear on the Polish frontier and ask for permission to cross. "The Gay-Pay-Oo has issued orders to arrest all the camels in the country," they explain. "But you are not camels," is the reply of the Polish guards. "Just try to prove that to the Gay-Pay-Oo," reply the terrified rabbits (p. 329).

The flavor of the book is in this quoted conundrum: "Who can live sweetly in Russia?" Answer: "Only Gorky." (Gorky in Russian means "bitter.") A hit at the comfortable life of the Laureate in Moscow and at Sorrento.)

JESSE HALSEY.

The Seventh Presbyterian  
Church, Cincinnati, Ohio.

**Plays of American Life.** By FRED EASTMAN. New York: Samuel French. \$2.50.

ACHIEVING a drama that is designed to do something more for the actor and the audience than furnish an outlet for escaping life through entertainment, is one of the ideals that all of us interested in drama would like to see consummated. Our life has been vigorous, robust and over-hurried. It has not been shot through with deeper motives that would make us act religiously, nor has it been predominantly reflective of a serious attitude toward the major problems of the world in which we have found ourselves so often in a strategic position. Drama reflects life and inevitably it reflects life on its most apparent and obvious level. It is a matter of meeting an audience on a ground that it will understand and of obtaining possession of the mind and emotion of that audience for a given period of time. Drama with a strong religious flavor, therefore, has had a precarious growth, largely because our life has not been reflecting the deeper spiritual aspects of our experience. Too often,

as we have said, drama has been used as an escape from life rather than as a means of interpreting it.

In a sense a volume entitled *Plays of American Life* is a challenging volume. We look into it eagerly, hoping to find interpretation and understanding which will bring us more closely toward the ideals which we have set up as Christian and as possibilities for a fine American type. It would be asking too much for any man to give us a full-grown interpretation of our varied existence. A thousand plays have not done it, nor has any one been typical. The plays in this volume, therefore, are rightly named, but for the uninitiated reader they are likely to boast something which they do not contain. These are plays written with a purpose, with a dramatic technique obviously manipulated. They are not presented to the world as anything more than they are, and Doctor Eastman would probably be the last to claim for them more than they represent.

Doctor Eastman's exemplary work for popularizing drama in the church has been accomplished through two separate avenues. Through his articles he has made us conscious of its importance, and through his plays he has given us a very definite contribution. *Bread* and *The Great Choice* are too familiar to need comment. They are the best of his work. Less valuable because they are more obvious are *Our Lean Years*, *The Doctor Decides*, and *America on Trial*. *The Tinker* is the only full-length play in the volume. It does not seem to achieve its purpose as well as the shorter pieces, although it is thought-provoking. Some of the minor pieces in the book are scarcely worthy of inclusion. The field of religious drama has needed good plays. Doctor Eastman has made a notable contribution. It is unfortunate that some of

the material has been included. In our anxiety to furnish material which has been demanded, we have oftentimes been over-eager to publish. This is not a condemnation of Doctor Eastman's work, it is a criticism which he will agree is pertinent in that the religious drama field is being flooded by hastily written, mediocre and bad plays. The most popular of Doctor Eastman's plays can be secured in individual copies, and I have a feeling that these will be most valuable to the average church. For libraries and churches wishing to make a collection of plays for the church, this single volume edition of Doctor Eastman's work will be welcomed.

HAROLD A. EHRENSPERGER.

Chicago, Illinois.

**The Book of Day.** By CHARLES FREDERICK WISHART. New York: Oxford University Press. \$1.00.

In this brief book of sixty-eight pages Doctor Wishart has made the *Apocalypse* fascinating. He has achieved this by means of a flashing style in which wit, humor, reminiscence and striking illustration adorn each page, and by a fine homiletic instinct which applies the message of *Revelation* to spiritual problems with unfailing insight. He has thrown light upon the most mystifying book of the canon.

Doctor Wishart holds in high regard the literary approach initiated by Grotius, developed and represented, at its best, by Richard G. Moulton. "The only fresh note which the writer would pretend to strike is in the linking up of the literary approach with devotional and doctrinal interpretation. . . . The sweep and surge of the sea may be forgotten while men analyze the components of salt water."

To pick flaws would be ungracious.

Better still, it is extremely difficult. However, one might cock an eyebrow at the interpretation which the author gives to the first of the four horsemen (6. 2). His frankly literary method leads him to see in the rider of the white horse Christ himself, thus preserving a dramatic unity between the appearance of this rider and the appearance of Christ, similarly mounted, in 19. 11. Doctor Wishart is in good company here with literati like Moulton and exegetes like Milligan, yet the weight of evidence, especially from later commentators, runs heavily against him. (C. A. Scott, Beckwith, Moffatt, Holtzmann, Bousset, Wellhausen, Swete.) But authorities are often depressing. Doctor Wishart is always exhilarating. "For two thousand years we have been trying to march the white horse and the red horse (war) side by side. It cannot be done. . . . Either the rider on the white horse will conquer the rider on the red horse, or be conquered by him; the latter unthinkable if you are a Christian."

*The Book of Day* is a masterpiece of condensation in that the author has sacrificed neither power nor beauty on the altar of brevity. He has placed his readers deeply in his debt, for he has brought out treasure old and new, echoing always with conviction John's glorious note of hope, of "power in the dawning" for a world weary and fearful, bowed down beneath its weight of cares.

DANIEL RUSSELL.

Rutgers Presbyterian Church,  
New York City.

**Speaking of Religion.** By BRUCE CURRY. New York: Charles Scribner's Sons. \$1.50.

In their jacket-comment on this book the publishers speak of the author as "brave," and probably without exaggera-

tion. For this little volume is a thorough-going attempt to think through the tangle of present-day theology to a "faith which, in Kiropp Lake's phrase, 'will satisfy the soul of the saint without disgusting the intellect of the scholar.'" This is a brave venture for anyone who does the job thoroughly.

Doctor Curry takes as his theme the differentiation of High Religion from Low Religion. The criteria whereby he distinguishes between the two are (1) intellectual content, (2) ethical attitudes, and (3) trust in spiritual as against material forces. High Religion, while it "knows the limitations of human reason," holds itself open to all truth without fear for itself; believes in an advancing ethics and in "subtle spiritual rewards" to those who are sensitive to the highest ethical standards; trusts in good will and love rather than in force or money, in God rather than in Mars or Mammon.

In his somewhat eclectic pursuit of this High Religion, the author necessarily has to throw out much which fails to make the grade. Before the book is finished, he has applied his lodestone to fundamentalism, extreme liberalism, Barthianism and Buchmanism and has found in all of them too much of Low Religion. While finding these aspects of Christianity unsatisfactory, he discovers that High Religion is not necessarily limited to his own faith and states boldly that, in some respects, high Christianity has more in common with high Judaism than it has with low Christianity.

Nevertheless, the book does not impress the reader as being negative in character—and for two reasons, as this reviewer sees it. First, Doctor Curry saves himself by not trying to be funny. He does not yield to the common temptation of holding up believers in outmoded

theology to scorn, nor does he poke fun at them. He is not flippant in his denials. He never writes with his tongue in his cheek. Second, after he has finished with his thoroughgoing examination, he emerges with a High Religion of his own which conserves practically everything in Christianity that has a permanent spiritual value. It will be hard even for rejected schools to make war against one who is transparently sincere, and who believes firmly in God, in Christ and the Christian religion, in immortality, prayer, and the sacrificial way of life.

One valuable emphasis of the book is its manner of dealing with the natural versus the supernatural. The author points to the fact that with the advance of man's knowledge, the natural progressively encroaches upon the supernatural. He then defines the supernatural as "the not-yet known," and finds the place of religion not in that field but in the realm of moral and personal values.

Written so that the theologically untrained may read it, this is a useful volume and would seem to the writer to be a hopeful sign that liberalism has taken on new life instead of having been buried in the grave as some would have us believe.

WILLIAM K. ANDERSON.  
Franklin Street Methodist  
Episcopal Church,  
Johnstown, Pennsylvania.

**Christ and Evolution. *The Doctrine of Redemption in the Light of Modern Knowledge.*** By GEORGE A. BARTON. Philadelphia: University of Pennsylvania Press. \$2.00.

It is commonly supposed that a modern theologian is negative and has few positive convictions for a triumphant belief in Christianity. The book under review demonstrates that this is an error

and that it is possible to be strictly scientific in outlook and method and yet have a firm hold on the essentials of the Gospel. This is the great value of the book.

Professor Barton (not to be confounded with Bruce Barton) is an evolutionist. He believes that man evolved from an animal ancestry and that it took two million years to do it. But what distinguishes man from the most intelligent animal is that he has a soul, an ability to discern the difference between right and wrong—a conscience. This is, relatively speaking, a recent acquisition, going back five thousand or at the most ten thousand years.

The biblical story of the Fall represents a genuine experience. It tells how man felt when he became conscious of the dawning of a conscience, "knowing good and evil," of the emergence of a sense of sin, destroying the paradise of animal enjoyment in which he had previously found happiness. It opened up the possibility of moral power and the consciousness of the need of a Saviour in the ensuing struggle.

But Professor Barton is a theistic evolutionist. He believes that the materialistic obsession is exploded and that there are reasons for belief that there is behind the universe a Power with whom man can commune. This Power is personal, intelligent, purposive, and friendly. This belief in God came by slow degrees. Down to the eighth century before Christ, the mind of man was unable to conceive of deity as pure spirit, but with it came also the birth of monotheism—the perception of the absolute personal unity of the spiritual power which controls the world. This was the contribution of the prophets of Israel. There are two avenues of God to man and of man to God: the mind and the religious consciousness. The religious consciousness of mankind has experienced communion

with God; and the religious consciousness has in its field as much right to be heard as the mind of man in its field. The great mystics of history have a claim to be heard; and the Master of all of them and greatest Witness to the character of God is Jesus Christ.

The chapter on "Jesus Christ and His Work" occupies significantly the central portion of the book. The life of Jesus Christ, according to the author, is the greatest event in the spiritual history of mankind. His perfect character, triply attested by unparalleled insight, by perfect living, and heroic death, was God's gift to man—God's instrument for the completion of the creation of that infant moral being that became possible when the human conscience was born. It is at once the proof of the incarnation and the explanation of its possibility. In ethical character and quality the life of Jesus was one with the life of God. This is the real *homoousios*. The incarnation was no break of the natural order. Evolution must not be interpreted materialistically: it is simply God's way of doing his creative work. The coming of Jesus was just another of his creative acts, accomplished for a still greater creative purpose, the making of a race of sons of God.

All this has its vital bearing upon the salvation of the world, social, economic, racial, and international. It contemplates a society of men and women enough like the pure and loving God to be called his children. The divine means to this end is Jesus Christ, who reproduces his teachings and life in the life of those who enter into spiritual union with him.

The Christian Church has always had to reshape its creeds, theology, and worship. It will have to do so again. It will lead to the adoption of a biological theory of the Atonement in which the

moral and spiritual influence will have the dominant and effective place. Worship has for its function to help men to co-operate with God in the completion of the creation of their own souls and the coming of the kingdom. To do such essential service it must speak not in obsolete but in truthful and understandable terms.

It is not easy to be just to the merits of this book and not appear to exaggerate. It points the way to be intellectually honest and at the same time evangelical and evangelistic. It will prove a boon to such as are trained in modern ways of thinking and love the church. It is the mature product of one of the foremost biblical scholars of the world, clear, calm, convincing, and reassuring. It is one of the most heartening evidences of the vitality of the Christian faith that the author, who for a full lifetime has taken an active part in the discussion of some of the most intricate biblical and religious subjects, retains not only his interest in it, but with increasing fervor champions it. It is worthy of all commendation.

ISMAR J. PERITZ.

Syracuse University.

#### God and the Social Process. By

LOUIS WALLIS. Chicago: University of Chicago Press. \$2.00.

THE author of this volume is well known for his previous volume on *Sociological Study of the Bible*, and the present work has been well chosen as the January selection of the Religious Book Club. It is a noteworthy book and will prove indispensable to all serious students of the Old Testament.

Westcott once remarked that the Bible should be treated like any other book, and by so doing, he added, we would find it was unlike any other. Nevertheless,

we all start with a prejudice in this matter, for we have been accustomed to regard this book as "sacred history." "We consequently accepted a version of Hebrew history which made out of it a fantastic tradition that only began to take on the semblance of reality within the recollection of living men" (quoted on p. vii). That is true, though we fail to see the full implications of this statement; the statement might almost be taken as the text of the writer's whole discourse. The discovery of the papyri—that wondrous romance of the Egyptian desert—has long since subverted the idea that the Greek of the New Testament was "the language of the Holy Ghost"; Bauer and Leander have recently rewritten Hebrew grammar and shown that Hebrew was a "Mischsprache" (mixed speech), and here Doctor Wallis is showing us that Hebrew civilization was a "Mischkultur" (mixed culture). "The so-called 'conquest of Canaan' brought into existence a 'melting-pot' which remolded and fused the ideas and cultures of the older and newer inhabitants" (p. 68). Here we see the ancient "Kulturkampf," the struggle between "misphat" and "baalism"—one might almost say between Socialism and Conservatism—which is the writer's central theme. It is good that this should be set forth as the author sets it, for there is nothing we require more to-day than just a secular history of Israel. We see here the whole Semitic background, with its general pattern of culture and the fierce play and interplay of economic forces which must surely have been a deciding factor here as in other civilizations. "That the social impulse was the great dynamic power which underlay the upward evolution of Hebrew religion is the lesson of Hebrew history" (p. 177).

In this volume Old Testament criticism passes from the literary-historical

field into the economic-sociological realm. Progress is more likely to be achieved along this line than on the other, where there seems little possibility of advance at the moment. It is inevitable, perhaps, that there should be a certain amount of "woolliness" in the discussion; the figure of Moses is somewhat dim here and we are left wondering about Abraham. The author might have been clearer as to the relative value of myth and legend, for if Abraham is "the mythical patriarch" there can be no "legends about Abraham." A myth is without historical foundation but legend has a basis in history.

Doctor Wallis has thrown a flood of light on the Old Testament and presents us with a reasonable view of Hebrew history and a new sense of the social forces animating the evolution of monotheism. The book does much to make the Old Testament live, for it deals with living issues in a vital way.

JOHN PATERSON.

Drew University.

**Social and Religious Problems of Young People.** By SIDNEY A. WESTON and S. RALPH HARLOW. New York: The Abingdon Press. \$1.75.

FEW books meet so many needs as does this one. Assuming that it falls into the hands of a leader who knows how to guide a co-operative thinking process or into the hands of a young person who is eager to come to his own decisions about important questions, this book will have significant value.

The book is timely and should have a wide usage for a number of reasons. It is built according to the best accepted educational procedure. It deals with timely questions and gives valuable suggestions to the individual or to groups

for carrying on a thorough investigation. One of the problems facing the modern church is to find a way by which Christian young people can become intelligently interested in the social issues that face our modern day. Young people are interested in personal matters like friendship, popularity, how to get along with others, how to be popular, how to get the car from dad, and so on. They should have these personal interests, but we can never make any social progress until they become interested in the social forces that are molding our present world, and neither can they find lasting solutions to their personal problems without doing something with the social world in which they live. The fact that this book is built around strategic social questions and at the same time guides the individual or group in dealing with those questions from a Christian standpoint and on the basis of co-operative thinking makes it a significant book.

Another need met by this book is that it is so closely related to the actual world in which young people are living. There is no chasm between the learner and this book. They are part of the same stream of human experiences. This quality ought to make it a valid and valuable guide to individual and group study.

In addition to being a guide for individual or group study, the book contains valuable source material, both in terms of verbatim reports of conversation and in terms of important quotations. It seems to be significant from the standpoint of curriculum construction.

The only negative feeling the reviewer has about the book is that some of the conversation seems rather trite and unimportant. Also, some of it does not seem quite true to life. The wise leader, however, can overcome this deficiency.

This is a book which will be of great

value in individual and group study in the church, in camps and conferences, and in freshman groups in college.

Roy A. BURKHART.  
The First Community Church,  
Columbus, Ohio.

**What Is This Christianity?** By EDWARD S. WOODS. New York: Harper & Brothers. \$2.00.

HERE is a book with an interesting history. It is a product of the Anglican Church, and the author, the Bishop of Croydon, is a clear thinker and an able writer. Several years ago his brother Theodore, at that time Bishop of Winchester, wrote a book entitled *What Is God Like?* It had a large sale, and he was asked to write a companion volume, to be called *What Is This Christianity?* Before his untimely death he had made a rough outline of the work. In completing the task, Bishop Woods feels that he has set forth the Christian message in much the same way as his brother would have done.

Bishop Woods shows some degree of trepidation in adding to what he calls "the already large number of little books on religion." It must be admitted that there is no paucity of volumes of this kind. Most of them are meritorious. Many of them, however, are so lacking in distinctiveness that their publication can hardly be justified. At the outset one wonders if the present work might not belong to this group. But a book can be estimated only by reading it. We cannot proceed very far in Bishop Woods' chapters without discovering that we are coming into contact with what is considerably more than another "little book on religion." It is a fine piece of work stylistically. The language has that color, opulence and vigor which are the

products of wide horizons and first-hand thinking.

The book as a whole pulsates with life. It is not entirely free from paragraphs dominated by a sacramentalism in which the American reader is not especially interested, but these dead passages are relatively few. The work is religious as well as theological. The concluding chapter contains an exceptionally helpful discussion of the technique of prayer. A comparatively brief book summarizing the essentials of Christianity is necessarily somewhat limited as to originality. Bishop Woods gives us the substance of contemporary religious thought, but his material is vitalized by his independence of approach and catholicity of sympathies.

A distinctive characteristic of this interpretation of Christianity is its synthesis of the individual and the social emphasis. In one thought-filled passage we find the following statement of the basis of a Christian society: "Opportunity for the due development of every human personality, an effective desire to promote the common good and prevent the exploitation of any class or section, a deep conviction that you cannot love your neighbor without loving God, and a keen sense that this earthly scene is meaningless apart from its eternal background."

LEWIS H. CHRISMAN.  
West Virginia Wesleyan College.

**What About God?** By ROGER W. BABSON. New York: Fleming H. Revell Company. 75 cents.

WE are likely to think of Roger W. Babson as steeped in statistics, poring over some tome on economics, or lecturing on an intricate monetary problem, and yet here he is offering a book, *What About God?* dealing with what are often called the higher things of life. From the "Dis-

mal Science" to "Roseate Religion" might fairly describe this transition from the matter-of-fact world of dry statistics and economic problems to the less tangible but more potent religious forces of life. Although it must be said that even in this, his latest book, he does not lose his hold upon mundane things. Indeed, his belief is that all things in life lead to God, no matter how dull or earthly they may be. As one illustration of this he has prepared a table showing "steps to God." Unlike Jacob's ladder, on which the angels descended from above to man below, these steps ascend to God above. On one side they are built of matter, vapor, sound, heat, light, electricity, cosmic rays; on the other side, sensations from clothing, food and shelter, pleasures, education, music, honor, peace, love, and finally God at the pinnacle.

One must not expect to read about "pure religion" only, because Mr. Babson expresses his opinion very definitely on practically all of the vexing problems which confront this harassed world. If the reader is not careful he will find himself mixing God with mechanical inventions, labor difficulties, graft, politicians, crime and its prevention, the training of children, war, taxation, statistics, brotherhood, all discussed in two or three paragraphs. And that is apparently the effect which Mr. Babson wishes to produce, for he believes that God as a spirit is under all and over all and in all. Having this in mind, one finds Mr. Babson's little book interesting and "different," although it is hardly possible to agree with all that he says. The thoughtful layman will not follow all the way in some of his economic and governmental theories, nor agree with all his statements on current affairs. The minister may find his theology askew. But why call attention to these things, when the author

has apparently one object only—to present to laymen a layman's idea of God, and that all things center in him?

He gives what he calls seven scientific facts. (1) The Godly spirit is always working. (2) The Bible holds the key to God. (3) Through prayer we get power. (4) It is natural to be happy. (5) We can be reborn through love. (6) Everything works out all right. (7) Finally, love is eternal. His method of treating these points is shown by his paragraph under the first scientific fact, which I quote:

"We know that since the world first began to be formed, some divine power has been working to develop perfection. A study of geology, biology and history clearly proves this to be a fact. This perfection is called 'Heaven,' although the word has been greatly misrepresented. The power is spiritual. All things are mere tools which can be used either to construct or destroy, according to whether or not the owner is actuated by Love. Let it be remembered that this divine power works independently of man. It was at work even before man existed. This is why Love is a fundamental power, more potent even than gravitation. Man does not generate it. It is always at work. *Man merely has the opportunity of working with it or of attempting to escape it. To work with it, is righteous; to ignore it, a sin.*" (Italics his.)

Mr. Babson's creed, briefly and cogently stated, is one which can be accepted by any layman, so long as he may, if he wishes, take a little liberty in interpretation. I do not pretend to say what the clergy may think of it.

"I believe in God, as the motive in the myriad beneficent evolutionary processes of the universe; in prayer as the door through which this Power comes into our

lives; in Jesus as the great revealer of this Power to mankind; in love as the greatest means of redeeming the world; and in the immortality of goodness."

What a hopeful sign it is that laymen, "hard-headed business men," are beginning to talk and write about God, not as set apart from the world, "sitting on the throne up in the heavens," as Mr. Babson puts it, dealing only with religious and moral questions, but God as a Spirit, an all-pervading Spirit, affecting not only spiritual but material affairs, so that the "rudest physical and spiritual forces develop into higher forces until they converge into one great Spirit." The belief has become quite general that life is not divided, with business on one side and religion on the other, week days for earthly affairs and Sundays for religion, but that it is a perfect whole, and that God can be just as manifest in a business transaction as in a religious rite.

Mr. Babson has chosen a great theme, and presented it with earnestness and conviction. Written in an informal way, it is like a series of talks which Mr. Babson so delightfully gives when with a few friends.

GEORGE S. HAWLEY.

Bridgeport, Connecticut.

#### Religion and the American Dream.

By RAYMOND C. KNOX. New York: Columbia University Press.  
\$1.75.

THIS book is doubly significant, for its own sake and for the circumstances which led to its writing. After many years of service as chaplain of Columbia University, Dr. Raymond C. Knox was commissioned by the Administrative Board of Religion and Social Activities to study "the whole question of religious instruction in the life of the modern college and university" in the light of what

is now being done in other countries and in other systems of education. The result of that study Doctor Knox has embodied in a "Report on Significant Religious Conditions and Movements in Europe, 1932-33," which was submitted to President Butler. He has preferred, however, to separate his own conclusion from this technical study and to embody it in an independent volume.

This conclusion is that American education taken in the large has suffered from the divorce between religion and secular education, which has been the natural, perhaps the inevitable, consequence of the concentration of religious instruction in specific institutions. While it is easy to account historically for the reasons which led to the adoption of this policy, its results have been none the less unfortunate. It has deprived American education as a whole of the unifying principle which in the judgment of Chaplain Knox can only be supplied by religion, and has delivered it over to the tyranny of the specialists, from which, as the most enlightened students of education agree, we are now suffering.

If education is to recover its true function as a preparation for life, this situation must be changed. We must no longer be content to leave religion on the periphery of the educational system, one among others of a constantly increasing number of competing electives. We must restore it to its place at the heart of the whole.

In this re-emphasis upon the central function of religion, Doctor Knox relies upon the sympathy, if not the active support, of contemporary authorities in education. Thus he quotes Doctor Counts as saying (page 42):

"Quite as important is that ideal factor in culture which gives meaning, direction, and significance to life. I refer to

the element of faith or purpose which lifts man out of himself and above the level of his more narrow personal interests."

It is for the lack of such a unifying world view that society is suffering today. What we need in the life of society, as of the individual, is a view of the whole. This view faith in God supplies, and Doctor Knox believes that there is no substitute. All the more important, therefore, is it that the university, which is interested in the harmonious cultivation of all sides of human life, should restore religion to the central place in its educational system. If this study shall contribute in any degree to this much to be desired result, it will have rendered a useful service alike to education and to religion.

WILLIAM ADAMS BROWN.  
Union Theological Seminary.

**The New Testament Idea of Revelation.** By ERNEST FINDLAY SCOTT.  
New York: Charles Scribner's Sons.  
\$2.00.

PROFESSOR SCOTT always has his "ear to the ground" in the field of theology. He was one of the first to perceive that the Johannine question, once thought to be settled finally, would assume a new form. So too on the Kingdom of God he early diagnosed its centrality and apocalyptic reference. In this book he has grasped the significance of the reaction from immanence to transcendence, as seen in the rise of Barthianism, and the importance of exploring afresh the notion of revelation.

"Revelation," he says, "implies the disclosure of a realm of truth which cannot be apprehended by sense, or by ordinary process of thought. It is not obtained through any exertion of our own thought." It is a "given" that is im-

parted from "beyond" to man. We are taken through the preparation for revelation in the New Testament as seen in the Old Testament and in apocalyptic literature not without excursions into general revelation outside Israel. How far man, with unaided powers, can trace vestiges of the Creator in Nature, by unaided reason and through the premonitions of conscience, is thoroughly discussed. Then we have illuminating chapters on Jesus as The Revealer, Hellenistic knowledge of God as manifest in Philo and Gnosticism, Revelation in Paul's Teaching, The Conditions of Revelation, The Johannine Idea of Revelation, New and Old in Revelation, with a final chapter on The Spirit and the Church.

It scarcely needs to be said that Doctor Scott has a thorough mastery of all the relevant material. He is sparing in his references to current discussion on revelation, such as Barth and Brunner have given us, and even Archbishop Temple in *Nature, Man and God*. But Doctor Scott knows what is being said by others and keeps his own way. He puts the rival views and forms his own conclusions, which are carefully balanced statements, rich in suggestiveness. His elucidations of the Hebrew ideas of "glory" and "holiness" are notable features: likewise his estimate of the influence of Gnosticism upon early Christian theology.

Two points call for criticism. Doctor Scott constantly speaks of "direct knowledge of God," "an immediate sense of God" (*cf.*, e. g., pp. 225, 242) and of revelation as the imparting of truth or truths. In this respect, while affirming the Barthian insistence on man's "distance" from God, Doctor Scott does not present sufficiently the complementary truth that revelation is indirect, because refracted through the medium of human

speech. And, to our mind, Doctor Temple is nearer the facts when he writes, "What is offered to man's apprehension in any specific Revelation is not truth concerning God, but the Living God Himself." Still, in this book we have a most useful interpretation of what is "a burning question of the day": a book to be studied closely and one to be read again and again, and always with profit.

R. BIRCH HOYLE.

Exchange Professor at  
Western Theological Seminary.

**God Among the Germans.** By PAUL F. DOUGLASS. Philadelphia: University of Pennsylvania Press. \$3.

HERE is a book that unfolds the German church struggle as objectively as it does dramatically. Both sides are there in stark outline. German Christians, who seek to nationalize Christianity, and the oppositional church, which seeks to Christianize Nationalism—both are painstakingly interpreted. Paul F. Douglass' book, *God Among the Germans*, is a book written with the sustained interest of a Lloyd C. Douglas novel.

Paul F. Douglass knows Germany. I was in Berlin during 1931-32, when he was a fellow in political science at the University of Berlin. I saw his unusual ability to acquaint himself with the problems and temperament of another people. During those concluding years of the republic the forums for American students at our American Church in Berlin were often tense and tempestuous. Doctor Douglass served for a period as chairman. He was one of the most skillful we had.

Shall the church become the soul of the modern state, or its conscience? Nationalism is in no doubt about this. For it, as for unbridled capitalism, the church is a means to an end. Doctor Douglass

has happily coined the word "folkic" to translate *fölkisch*. But the word "tribal" is even as fitting for modern Germany. The sharpest picture left by his book is that of a life-and-death struggle between Nationalism and Christian universalism.

A year ago Hitler's purge shocked the world. Then came the assassination of Dollfuss. In March the Führer restored conscription. An air fleet and submarines followed hard upon. Men like Goebbels and Streicher continue anti-semitical fulminations unabated. All this is resulting in a moral and military isolation of Germany. Naziism arose because we kept the German people in a moral and military ghetto after the World War. Now we are solving the problem of Hitler by heating the ghetto seven times hot. Nazism is employing this isolation by a self-righteous world to intrench itself strongly in German emotion and thought process. The ghetto produces introspection. That is why typically "German" cults are threatening to sweep the masses away from internationalistic Christianity. When no one believes in us, we blatantly and pathetically believe in ourselves. This is the clue to the rise of modern paganism in Germany.

With this crisis of German civilization in mind, the chapters of Douglass on "The Racial Mysticism of Alfred Rosenberg" and on "Folkic Religions" are timely and enlightening. The Rosenberg chapter was translated into German and submitted to Herr Rosenberg, Hitler's chief journalist and educator. He approved it as an adequate summary of his philosophy. Count Reventlow, fiery Nazi anti-Christian publicist, aided Douglass personally in the chapter on folkic religions.

Especially valuable is the exposition of the German Christian movement. This theology has a deeper speculative subtlety

and emotional intensity than is generally recognized. It was my experience in Berlin that American preachers often felt more at home in conversation with the German Christians to whom I introduced them than with many of the ultra-transcendentalists among the opposition groups. Douglass has incorporated a greatly needed statement of the "creative principle" theology of Friedrich Wieneke. This writer is the star of the German Christians. He has given a racial basis to Christian doctrine. "The theological significance of Paul," according to Wieneke, in Douglass' paraphrase, "was that he was the first to sense the fact that while Christ is super-folkic in his nature, he is the Savior of every people in the light of the characteristics of their folkic community."

The opposition groups are presented as defending the heart of historic Christianity. A detailed and graphic account is given of the actual steps in the swift-moving struggle of Christ versus Cæsar. The author is so objective that his chapter on "The Christian Jew in the Third Reich" made me shudder a bit at its dispassionateness. The three-page summary of Barth's theology and its relation to post-war problems is well done.

I must conclude with a confession. When this book was first placed in my hands by Henry Smith Leiper my comment was, "It will be interesting, but it can hardly be impartial, for I knew P. F. D. in Berlin and he was so impressed with the Nazis that I doubt if he can fathom the principles which the oppositional clergy see at stake."

That former Paul Douglass did not write this book. I must confess I was wrong in judging in advance. As I read the pages of this interpretation I felt a breadth and a depth which I was puzzled to account for. On the very last page I

found the answer. This brilliant young mind has been grappling with life in making this study, and in the process he has been confronted with Christ. He sets down a creed in a way which puzzles one, for it seems to have no connection with what has immediately preceded. But when one reads the testimony which he adds, the light dawns. Here is the passage:

"A Christ who made humility a quality necessary for the inheritance of the Kingdom of God, who placed sacrifice at the center of life, who made service to others synonymous with salvation, and who defined his kingdom as progress, truth, life, and the pursuit of moral value, may still be the sovereign to whom men confess their highest allegiance. Such is not the theological outcome of the religious struggle in Germany, which incorporates the currents of conflict moving in our spiritual world. It is, however, the personal faith which the writer has found after two years of intimate study of the significance of Christ in the culture state of National Socialism."

EWART EDMUND TURNER.

Formerly Pastor of the American Church in Berlin.

#### **The Prophets and Israel's Culture.**

By WILLIAM CREIGHTON GRAHAM. Chicago: The University of Chicago Press. \$1.50.

ACCORDING to the author of this small but significant volume, culture may be defined as a way of living which is "distinguished by attentiveness to the total scene in which life is lived." A number of forces help to initiate and determine the way of men's living, such as physical habitat, climate, the instruments man invents in an effort to relate himself to nature, economic and political developments. But until religion makes its con-

tribution the way of living cannot be called culture. "When through the offices of religion that particular way of living has developed a philosophy of life, or in other words has shaped itself into what are to those who participate in it, meaningful patterns, then the results may be described as a culture" (p. 4).

Professor Graham (University of Chicago), with thorough knowledge of the conclusions of literary and historical criticism, the results of archaeological research in the Near East, and of the general history of Oriental religion, here presents "in brief and non-technical fashion" the part played by the Hebrew prophets in the development of Israel's culture. The chapter headings reveal the logical sequence of the discussion: "The World and Its Way," "Israel in the Way of the World," "The Prophets and the World's Way," "The Heart of the Prophetic Philosophy of Life," "The Dynamic of the Prophetic Philosophy of Life," "The Prophets and Progress."

In the ancient Orient, as in other parts of the world, man began as a hunter; later he became a keeper of herds, a farmer, and subsequently developed more complex ways of living. Generally speaking, throughout the successive stages of development the Oriental peoples had their gods; but their world view was materialistic; their gods were aspects of nature mythicized. "The super-force was impersonal, non-intelligent, non-purposive" (p. 18).

In early Israel conditions and beliefs were not very different. Here, too, appear attempts at integration based almost entirely on a materialistic philosophy of life. Some of the deplorable results in the conditions of the people, the author describes in these words: "Social contrasts became appalling, as a productive, hard-working peasantry is called upon to sup-

port not only a local ruling caste whose standards of living are set by those of their own overlords, but to yield up also its meed of wealth to the insatiable maw of the same overlords. The peasantry of Israel sinks into peonage, while those who rule them are willing to pay even that price for their own very relative economic and political security. But perhaps the crowning page in this sordid story, the thing that rouses the ire of the prophets more than anything else, is the fact that the accepted religious leadership, the priests and prophets of the dominant cultus, not only refuse to see what is going on, but acquiesce in it and even profit by it" (pp. 31, 32).

In the presence of these economic, political, and religious evils, the prophets realized that the one path to Israel's permanency lay through cultural distinctiveness. "Only if these people can somehow develop an inherently significant way of life, if they can build up some unique range of desires, some unusual philosophy, some distinctive ethic, in short, some philosophy of life, the sharing of which will make them brothers, any time, anywhere, under all circumstances, can Israel hope to escape oblivion, to remain an entity, to project itself down the corridors of time as a significant factor in the great human adventure" (p. 33).

The essence of the prophetic world view is expressed in these words: "The world is definitely a part of a universe that is the scene of the expression of a cosmic aim and plan which transcends the desires and purposes of man, but does not abandon man himself. This is a world with the whole of which man may be in co-operation and communion, a world in which the human experience may be seen as meaningful" (p. 49).

According to the prophets, "whatever is anti-personal has no abiding place in a

whole which is personal." At the center of the universe is a personal God who is also righteous, merciful, holy, always interested in the highest, not only the material, well-being of his people. The central emphasis and significance of the prophets is brought out in this description of Jeremiah's conviction, "that the ultimate reality is personal; that in the end the 'personality producing forces in the universe' must triumph; that progress in the deepest sense of the word is in the eternal scheme of things, progress, not of the few, but of the race that the future will bring to spiritual birth" (p. 85).

The author sums up his estimate of the permanent contributions made by the prophets to humanity's cultural progress in these sentences: "Through the impetus they gave, the cultus of the dominant system was gradually purged of sympathetic magic until the very rituals and myths were made the vehicle of the expression of a higher philosophy, a different way of interpreting the meaning of life. Through the drive of their social ideals, the place held by the common man in the brotherhood of Israel was gradually enlarged. Through the influence of their respect for human intelligence there developed in the course of centuries a passion for learning and education, for the part thought and meditation play in culture, which comes to a most notable expression in the first Psalm, where the 'law of the Lord' is not a mere instrument of social control, but a window that opens on the universe, a door into a larger life" (pp. 95-96).

Professor Graham's volume merits careful study, not only on the part of students of the Bible, and of those who are interested in culture past and present, but especially on the part of all who desire to understand the influence of

religion in culture, and to assist in the creation and development of a culture permeated by the ideals of righteousness, good will, brotherhood, and peace, inspired by the experience of the abiding presence and activity of a personal and holy God. Unlike the modern non-theistic humanists, the prophets insist that the only guarantee of permanent progress is faith in a personal God at the heart of the universe who, without destroying the freedom of the human will, is working out an eternal purpose which will find its ultimate realization in the establishment of the Kingdom of God on earth.

F. C. EISELEN.

Chicago, Illinois.

**The Rediscovery of John Wesley.**  
By GEORGE CROFT CELL. New York: Henry Holt & Company.  
\$2.50.

IN 1902-1903 the Presbyterian Church U. S. A. added Chapters XXXIV and XXXV, a Declaratory Statement, and other changes to the Westminster Confession. These changes remove the disputed points between Calvinism and Arminianism (when the latter is properly interpreted), in favor of Arminianism. Now comes Doctor Cell, who probably is among America's leading authorities in Wesleyana, to tell us that John Wesley held that "the true Gospel touches the very edge of Calvinism." Doctor Cell is properly concerned about the humanism, the Pelagianism, the tendency to fail to stress the necessity of regeneration or the new birth in and through Jesus Christ, and about similar signs of paralysis and sterility among Methodists and Protestants generally. There is scarcely a page whereon he does not, in a scholarly fashion, with thoroughgoing historical discernment and documentation, indicate that present-day

## RELIGION IN LIFE

humanistic tendencies are diametrically opposed to the message and teachings of John Wesley and therefore, since Wesley unreservedly held to "the Luther-Calvin idea of the sovereign saving significance of a God-given faith," are likewise opposed to the great Reformers and to the very heart and mind of the essential Gospel.

John Wesley is rightly set forth as being opposed to the Pelagianistic Arminianism of the Anglicanism of his day. It is conceded that on the disputed point of predestination which carried with it a limited atonement and the unfailing perseverance of the saints (it should be noted that such great Calvinistic scholars as Charles Hodge, Abraham Kuiper, and B. W. Warfield held predestination to be a very keystone in Calvinism's arch), Wesley went so far as to call it "Predestinarian poison." It is also pointed out that Wesley's theory of the atonement was not the substitutionary-penal theory of Calvinism, but was a synthesis of the satisfaction theory of Anselm-Hervey and the moral experiential theory of Abelard-Law.

Having admitted such vital differences as between Wesley and Calvin, nevertheless the author is insistent that the founder of Methodism was nearer to Calvin in the fundamentals of catholic evangelical Christianity than he was to the Arminianism of his own day, and much that has passed by that name ever since. He shows by well chosen quotations that Wesley agreed with both Calvin and Luther that: (a) the new birth or regeneration is wholly initiated and completed by the grace of God; (b) that faith itself is the gift of God; (c) that God is sovereign and controlling with only self-imposed limitations; (d) that there is no basis for a Socinian, Pelagian, or humanistic "libertarianism"; (e) that

all men are sinners and are in need of God-given redemption; (f) and that Neo-Platonic, non-social mysticism is to be condemned.

But any thesis that John Wesley was actually Calvinistic, holding to the distinguishing five (Doctor Cell errs in stating that there were three) points of Calvinism (total depravity, unconditional election, limited atonement, irresistible grace, and the unfailing perseverance of the saints) is not established. Having characterized the second point as "Predestinarian poison," having held the first point in a different sense than did Calvin, having rejected the last three points and holding to a different theory of the atonement, John Wesley cannot be said to have been Calvinistic. Since Doctor Cell's main object is to show that Wesley agreed with Calvin and Luther in what he (Doctor Cell) believes to be the fundamentals, there is a tendency to overlook the unique features that made Calvinism Calvinistic, the very features which Wesley rejected.

The entries in Wesley's *Journal* for August 24, 1743, as recorded on pp. 84-86 of Volume III of the Standard Edition, together with numerous quotations given by Doctor Cell himself, supporting the conceded anti-Calvinism of Wesley, all indicate that Wesley was an out-and-out Arminian after the pattern of the Arminian Remonstrants of 1610. The five negative and five positive articles of this Remonstrance will be found to constitute almost the warp and woof of John Wesley's Arminianism as opposed to Calvinism. (These articles in English appear in Philip Schaff's *Creeds of Christendom*, Vol. I, pp. 516-519.)

In these latter days, when the Calvinism of the Church of Scotland and of the Presbyterian Church U. S. A. (North) either is being or has been re-

vised, incorporating the Arminianism of 1610—and this revision is in no sense a trend toward humanism—it would seem to be much more to the point if Professor Cell would rediscover for this age the true meaning of Arminianism as held in 1610, and as held by John Wesley. This will not preclude an equally needed stress upon the eternally true phases of Lutheranism and Calvinism. Doctor Cell has provoked a much needed discussion which those who have perverted and misrepresented both Arminianism and Calvinism may well ponder and apply. The net result would be far more wholesome for the Kingdom of God by way of an antidote to the humanistic poisons in the present "crisis in religion" than are most of the scholastic, doctrinaire, pessimistic, penalistic-wrathful-God features of Neo-Calvinistic Barthianism. Read this book for yourself and allow Doctor Cell, with his keen mind and challenging conclusions, to have direct access to you. Doctor Cell is no ranting Fundamentalist. He has produced what is probably the most thoroughgoing analysis of John Wesley's theology that has appeared by an American author. His main thesis that Wesley was in full agreement with Calvin in opposition to humanism, to undesirable Pelagianism, and to Neo-Platonic mysticism is well established. Let John Wesley with his Arminianism of the early seventeenth century be rediscovered!

GAIUS JACKSON SLOSSER.

The Western Theological Seminary.

**The Apostolic Tradition of Hippolytus.** Translated into English, with Introduction and Notes by BURTON SCOTT EASTON. Cambridge: At the University Press. New York: The Macmillan Company. \$2.25.

No one interested in ritual, liturgy or

church history can afford to miss this book. Here the reader is given the most vivid picture historic records afford of second- and third-century worship usage in the Christian Church. Hippolytus himself is a unique character. A schismatic bishop of Rome, excommunicated and martyred, he was then canonized and straightway forgotten. In 1551 a third-century statue of Bishop Hippolytus was unearthed in Rome, but not until the twentieth century were certain anonymous writings discovered to be his. And it has remained for Doctor Easton to give the first English translation of the *Apostolic Tradition*, and the first critical edition in any language. Not only, more than any church father, did Hippolytus give permanent form to the laws and liturgy of the Eastern Church, but his was the eventual source of the forms in the Scottish and American Prayer Books. Here we have the earliest available ritual for ordinations, baptism, eucharist, agape, confirmation, catechumens, and lay devotions.

Most interesting side lights are to be seen on manners and customs in the second-century church. Hippolytus over a hundred years after Paul found it still necessary to rebuke unseemly conduct at the agape (Love Feast). Consider his attitude toward pacifism. Hippolytus says, regarding candidates for instruction in church membership, "A soldier of civil authority (that is, doing police duty) must be taught not to kill men and refuse to do so if he is commanded, and to refuse to take an oath; if he is unwilling to comply, he must be rejected. A military commander or civic magistrate that wears the purple must resign or be rejected. If a catechumen or a believer seeks to become a soldier, they must be rejected, for they have despised God." In the same category are placed harlots, licentious men, mountebanks, amulet-

makers, etc. Shades of the Supreme Court! And some people call the church to-day radical on pacifism! The instruction, "Let the bishop be ordained after he has been chosen by all the people," gives a hint of the early democratic ideal. The coupling of the "holy church" with the "Holy Spirit" in the earliest forms of the doxology hints at the growing doctrine of the church as a "divine institution" and a rift toward imperialism. In the Eucharistic liturgy we find the earliest formula for the words of institution to be: "And when he breaks the bread and distributes the fragments he shall say, *The heavenly bread in Christ Jesus.*" The familiar words of the *Sursum Corda* (but not the *Sanctus* itself) are found exactly as used to-day in the Lord's Supper and Ordination of Bishops. Some liturgical features being stressed to-day as new, are as old as the second century, such as "liturgical silence." Hippolytus writes in the Ordination ritual (for bishops): "The presbytery shall stand in silence. All indeed shall keep silence, praying in their heart for the descent of the Spirit."

The ritual for baptism was evidently more elaborate in the second century than to-day. It involved a threefold baptism with question and answer preceding each immersion, and then two anointings with oil, both with ceremonial liturgy, followed by the Eucharist, at the conclusion of which the bishop said, "And when these things are completed, let each one hasten to do good works, and to please God and to live aright, devoting himself to the church, practicing the things he has learned, advancing in the service of God." We may be thankful for an increasing tendency toward simplicity in baptismal ritual, but any form for the holy communion might well contain the spirit of such an exhortation. Another thing worthy of note is that the

*Apostolic Tradition* gives us the first unambiguous evidence for extempore prayer at the Eucharist, a tradition still preserved in some communions. Bishop Hippolytus was the pro-conservative of his day. His translator, Doctor Easton, sums this up: "Hippolytus closes with a final adjuration to avoid all novelties; the way to peace consists solely in strict adherence to the past." He may have been a third-century conservative, but in some things he would still be found too radical for twentieth-century Christianity.

FRED WINSLOW ADAMS.  
Boston University.

#### Christ's Alternative to Communism.

By E. STANLEY JONES. New York:  
The Abingdon Press. \$2.00.

THIS book is well worth anybody's perusal. Two groups will be specially benefited by it. The first consists of those persons who have lost faith in the capitalistic system, and who, burdened with the consciousness of unrealized good in the social order, are groping and stumbling across the misty flats toward materialistic Communism. Those who have gone the farthest in this direction will probably not be helped much by Stanley Jones. They will be quite apt to dismiss his book as so much rhetoric and his findings as the natural emotional reaction of a man whose impulses are good.

Nevertheless, those who are dissatisfied with To-day, and who are in quest of a Better To-morrow, but who are losing their sense of moral direction, will be helped. They will find Stanley Jones sympathetic with the aims and much of the program of Communism. "There is more genuine Christian spirit," he declares, "in the Communist demand for the rights and the opportunities of the common man than there was in the Rus-

sian Orthodox Church, with its superstitions and with its alliance with inhuman Czarism." He approves of the Soviet's prison, school and hospital systems; its attitude toward different races; its attempt to "produce an order where there are no parasites living on others," and a society which is co-operative instead of competitive.

At the same time he points out the intermittances and faults of the Russian experiment—its ruthless revenge; its hatred; its lying and its misrepresentations; its absolute power, which is becoming more and more tyrannical and all pervading; its autocratic system of violence which "inevitably attracts moral inferiors"; its tyrannical unfairness that has silenced every prophetic voice of religion in Russia.

People who are dissatisfied with the present order are summoned by Stanley Jones to Christ's alternative to Communism—the Kingdom of God, which is "a new order breaking into and regenerating the total old order," containing all that is good in Communism. "Just what form that collective sharing would take I am not certain. But that it would not be synonymous with Communism is equally certain. . . . Communism is not the goal, but the Kingdom of God is." The kind of life we want to live, says Jones, we have seen in operation in the life of Jesus. "We are not following a Utopian dream, we are endeavoring to universalize an accomplished fact."

The second group who will be specially helped by this book consists of those good, evangelistic people who plead for "the simple Gospel," by which they generally mean that they object to

the application of the Gospel to social, political and economic affairs. Because of his sincerity and piety, and because of the mystical, evangelistic spirit which pervades all his work, Stanley Jones can tell such people—even better than can "liberals" who know more about the subject—that "Christianity cannot fit into a competitive order," and that "Ye cannot serve God and the private profit motive." "How," he asks, "can we as Christian people develop spirituality when at the heart of all our economic relationships is the unspiritual fact of the competitive attitude?" "This world of ours cannot exist half stuffed and half starved." The race between Communism and the Kingdom of God is challengingly portrayed throughout the book. Christ is shown able to bear the strain.

Epigram and apt illustration delight the lover of good writing. For example: "The program without the power is pretense, the power without the program is piffle." "We are pilgrims of the Infinite." "There is nothing more obvious on the horizon than the tired humanists. They lack inner resources, and hence life becomes too much for them." "The new Kingdom is color blind. It sees man and not the tincture of his skin."

Stanley Jones knows his Bible. He uses it effectively, sometimes literally, sometimes allegorically. The Scripture that runs like a motif through the volume is Christ's inaugural sermon, preached in his home-town synagogue. The author holds that Gospel against the light on different levels until it seems as fresh and new as April lilacs dashed with dew.

DANIEL L. MARSH.  
President of Boston University.

## Bookish Brevities

READING, like art, extends and intensifies experience. Without it one is condemned to be a provincial who perpetuates fallacious generalizations which are broadcast upon insufficient information.

William Rose Benét pronounces William Butler Yeats to be the greatest living poet in the English language.

An edition of *That Strange Man Upon His Cross*, by Richard Roberts, Moderator of the United Church of Canada, has been published in England. It is described there as an impassioned yet firmly controlled and concise argument for the supreme value of the intrusion of the disturbing personality of Jesus and of the Cross, the most disturbing element in his life story.

Often is it said that personality and not preaching is the effective apologetic for to-day. Doless cynicism and anemic pessimism, outside and within, scuttle before a sunlighted, intelligent, sympathetic and forthright Christian personality. Then seems it not strange that so little American Christian biography has been written? We need life stories which unveil the Infinite and contribute to sensitive understanding of varied persons and social situations.

The idleness incident to the continued business depression has decoyed many of the ungifted into attempts at remunerative writing. One editor is unkind enough to tell of being approached by such a novice who enquired if he had

any opening for a paragraphist of real genius. "Yes," replied this editor, waving his hand with a circular motion, "we have, as you see, several doors and many windows."

In a recent magazine article Ernest Hemingway asserts that *Huckleberry Finn* is the most American book, the book most directly in and behind the tradition of the most American writing. Henry Seidel Canby seconds and asserts the dictum, and comments that *Huckleberry Finn* is not only one of the best ten books written in America; it is one of the best books written in English in the nineteenth century.

Principal John Oman has retired from Westminster College, Cambridge, after having been its Principal for thirteen years and a Professor for twenty-eight years. He was greatly honored by the General Assembly of his church, where he was described by the Moderator as one who had taught men to stand up to life as an experienced seaman stands up to the storm when he knows that the course is set and the end of the journey sure.

Principal Oman is to be succeeded by Professor Elmslie, whose chair is to be occupied by Professor Herbert H. Farmer, another contributor to RELIGION IN LIFE. During his four years at Hartford, Doctor Farmer has earned distinction as a preacher and a writer and many are they who regret that he feels constrained to follow the example of Professor John Baillie in returning to his Alma Mater.

Long before he did much of his best work, Justice Oliver Wendell Holmes was pronounced by John Morley to be the greatest Judge in the English-speaking world. His death deprives the readers of *RELIGION IN LIFE* of an interesting article on the religious views of his riper years which he had promised through Bishop John W. Hamilton, whom he admired. In middle life Justice Holmes announced as his creed: "Life is action, the use of one's powers. As to use them to their height is our joy and duty, so it is the one end that justifies itself."

Dr. George Jackson, whose authority as a discriminating appraiser of good literature is long established, is convinced that they are wrong who think that the religious interests are a dying fire. He offers as evidence that the British Bible Society put into circulation last year more than ten million copies of the Scriptures, that within a year a million copies of the new British Methodist Hymn-book have been sold, that the best seller of the last Christmastide was Morton's *In the Steps of the Master*, and that the recent jubilee celebrations were characterized by deep religiousness among all classes of English people.

In his new book, *What You Owe Your Child*, Dean Willard L. Sperry warmly defends the old-fashioned memorization of the classical beauty-spots of the Bible.

Dean Luther A. Weigle also has been cautioning against the undue neglect of this important phase of religious education. "In memorizing passages of Scripture," he says, "we store up in our minds beautiful statements of truth which will remain a permanent possession and con-

stitute a spiritual resource to the end of life."

Dr. Lucius H. Bugbee verified this value when in a recent operation he was plunged into darkness for several days and attested that his memory of Scripture was one of his most assuring comforts.

Dr. Edwin Lewis' *A Christian Manifesto* has powerfully impressed the religious thinkers of Great Britain. The Literary Supplement of *The London Times* characterizes it as "an extremely interesting thesis, which is worked out with what is obviously a very thorough knowledge of modern theological writing, and deserves attention."

The *Manchester Guardian* says it is the reasoned statement of the conviction that a man may keep his mind open to all that science and philosophy and criticism have to teach him and yet remain loyal to the faith of the New Testament, which makes *A Christian Manifesto* the powerful document it is.

The *Christian World* speaks of *A Christian Manifesto* as "a striking and important book, which combines in an unusual degree adequate scholarship with passionate conviction." It continues: "Doctor Lewis has received some commendation from fundamentalists, but he is uneasy amid their praise, for as a scholar he recognizes that the old view of the Bible has gone never to return; but he maintains that the new view of the Bible can be held in conjunction with the essentials of the Christian faith and with all that makes that faith a gospel; provides indeed a surer foundation for it."

Coming to him they began to test him with a question (saying) "Master Jesus, we know that you have come

(from God) for the things which you do (testify) above all the prophets. (Tell) us (therefore) Is it lawful (to render) to kings the things which pertain to their rule? (Are we to render) to them or not?" But Jesus knowing their thought, being moved with indignation, said to them, "Why do you call me with your mouth Master, when you do not hear what I (say)? Well did (Isaiah) prophesy about you saying, This (people honor) me with their lips but their heart is far from me. In vain (do they reverence me). . . ."

The above is a portion of the translation of what appear to be fragments of a newly-found life of Christ, which has been made by Dr. W. F. Howard, the representative in England of the Advisory Council of RELIGION IN LIFE. Doctor Howard agrees with Mr. Idris Bell, an authoritative papyrologist, that this fragment was written not later than the middle of the Second Century and he esteems it to be priceless. It has been published by the British Museum as *Fragments of an Unknown Gospel and Other Early Christian Papyri.*

Life is poorer for many because of the translation to higher service of David G. Downey. For sixteen years he was the Book Editor of the Methodist Episcopal Church. He was a chaste and courageous gentleman and an accomplished littérateur. His nature is reflected in his meditations upon the wonder and worth of books.

"Most of us are imitative rather than original. We need the stimulus and the suggestiveness of other minds. The fire

smolders in our brain, but we need some one to blow it, to gather up the flickering embers and fan them to a flame. The one who does that for us is forever a friend, be he poet, historian, or naturalist. As one grows older he settles into secure friendships. This is so in affectional life, and equally so in intellectual life. Instinctively the man who knows and loves his books turns to certain authors according to his moods. On the shelves of every booklover's library are volumes that he can find in the darkest night and without the aid of candle. He can tell them by feel of finger, so often have they been thumbed."

"A good book strengthens the moral muscles and helps a man to 'gird up the loins of his mind.' . . . Some man of insight, with mental vision and moral sanity, traveled the same road and for our helping has written his experience in a book. As we read, we are heartened, comforted, and strengthened for work and service. We agree with him when he assures us that 'adversities nerve the spirit of a man.' . . . That's what adversities are for, and that, too, is what men are for, to meet and conquer adversities and in such conquering conquer themselves and help forward the higher conquest of the world. We need betimes

that blessed mood,  
In which the burthen of the mystery,  
In which the heavy and the weary weight  
Of all this unintelligent world  
Is lightened;"

"For the wonder, the spaciousness, the  
inspiration, and the friendliness of books,  
O Lord, we give thee thanks!"

V  
J  
W  
L  
H  
E  
C  
A  
R  
The  
The  
The  
Imp  
The  
Rel  
Chr

The  
The  
The  
John  
The  
The  
Book  
Book  
Inde

Editor  
Business  
Avenue  
Entered  
1879.  
Subscri  
foreign